

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, before the motion is put, I should like to give notice to the Senate that I shall to-morrow ask for unanimous consent to fix some date for a final vote upon the Chinese-exclusion bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After eight minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, April 10, 1902, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate April 9, 1902.*

##### CONSUL.

Charles V. Herdliska, of the District of Columbia, to be consul of the United States at Callao, Peru, vice William B. Dickey, removed.

##### RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Frank E. Densmore, of California, to be receiver of public moneys at Independence, Cal., his term having expired. (Reappointment.)

Willis H. Cofield, of Alva, Okla., to be receiver of public moneys at Alva, Okla., vice William J. French, removed.

##### REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES.

Stafford W. Austin, of California, to be register of the land office at Independence, Cal., his term having expired. (Reappointment.)

John D. Maxey, of California, to be register of the land office at Stockton, Cal., his term having expired. (Reappointment.)

##### COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Frank D. Roberts, of Missouri, to be collector of internal revenue for the sixth district of Missouri, to succeed F. E. Kellogg, resigned.

##### PROMOTIONS IN THE MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

Asst. Surg. Claude H. Lavinder, of Virginia, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

Asst. Surg. Taliaferro Clark, of Virginia, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

#### CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 9, 1902.*

##### SECRETARY OF LEGATION.

Edward Winslow Ames, of Massachusetts, to be secretary of the legation of the United States at Buenos Ayres, Argentine Republic.

##### POSTMASTER.

Edwin Fore, to be postmaster at Pittsburg, in the county of Camp and State of Texas.

#### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, April 9, 1902.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

##### PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to a personal explanation by the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the 7th instant, I was necessarily absent from the House. On that day, prior to the calling up of the bill to extend the charters of national banks, and in fact during this Congress, I have been paired with my friend from New Jersey, Mr. FOWLER. I was paired with him on that day, and the RECORD so shows. Upon the call of the roll on the passage of that bill I find by the RECORD that Mr. FOWLER voted "yea." Of course I did not vote. I had been unable to see the gentleman from New Jersey, although I have endeavored to do so, and I desire to make the statement that had I not known that we were paired I should have been present and should have voted against the bill. I am constrained to believe that my friend from New Jersey [Mr. FOWLER] either did not vote or voted by inadvertence, forgetting that he was paired.

##### CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE—FOWLER AGAINST THOMAS, THIRD DISTRICT NORTH CAROLINA.

Mr. OLMSTED, from Committee on Elections No. 2, presented the report of that committee in the contested-election case of John E. Fowler v. Charles R. Thomas, from the Third Congressional district of North Carolina; which was ordered to be printed and referred to the House Calendar.

##### OLEOMARGARINE AND OTHER IMITATION DAIRY PRODUCTS.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 9206.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the following bill, which the Clerk will report by its title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9206) to make oleomargarine and other imitation dairy products subject to the laws of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia into which they are transported, and to change the tax on oleomargarine, and to amend an act entitled "An act defining butter, also imposing a tax upon and regulating the manufacture, sale, importation, and exportation of oleomargarine," approved August 2, 1886.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee and Mr. BURLESON. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made, and the bill will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

##### CUBAN RECIPROCITY.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 12765) to provide for reciprocal trade relations with Cuba.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union on the bill H. R. 12765.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. SHERMAN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 12765, the title of which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12765) to provide for reciprocal trade relations with Cuba.

##### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. VAN VOORHIS having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; to which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 1934. An act to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Biloxi, in the State of Mississippi;

S. 3421. An act for the relief of Eleonora G. Goldsborough;

S. 3992. An act granting an increase of pension to David M. McKnight;

S. 899. An act granting an increase of pension to George F. Bowers;

S. 2738. An act granting an increase of pension to James W. Hankins;

S. 694. An act granting a pension to Jane Caton;

S. 4042. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Norton;

S. 2975. An act granting an increase of pension to Levi Hatchett;

S. 4535. An act granting an increase of pension to Lydia M. Granger;

S. 3334. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. James;

S. 2409. An act granting a pension to John A. Rotan;

S. 234. An act granting a pension to James Frey; and

S. R. 74. Joint resolution relating to publications of the Geological Survey.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 11353) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. STEWART, Mr. PLATT of Connecticut, and Mr. RAWLINS as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 7290. An act granting an increase of pension to Lizzie B. Green;

H. R. 7847. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Wilson;  
 H. R. 2613. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. H. Gibbs;  
 H. R. 12375. An act granting a pension to Amelia A. Russell;  
 H. R. 3354. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Young;  
 H. R. 1476. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry F. Benson;  
 H. R. 3427. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Allen;  
 H. R. 11025. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Carlile;  
 H. R. 291. An act granting an increase of pension to Christina Heitz;  
 H. R. 1485. An act granting an increase of pension to Thompson B. Moore;  
 H. R. 4172. An act granting an increase of pension to George R. Chaney;  
 H. R. 3260. An act granting a pension to Jacob Golden;  
 H. R. 10957. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Stockings;  
 H. R. 4053. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry E. De Marse;  
 H. R. 7525. An act granting a pension to Marion Barnes;  
 H. R. 3876. An act granting an increase of pension to Theophile A. Dauphin;  
 H. R. 3884. An act granting an increase of pension to Erastus C. Moderwell;  
 H. R. 9378. An act granting a pension to Clara B. Townsend;  
 H. R. 10710. An act granting an increase of pension to Frances E. Scott;  
 H. R. 9654. An act granting a pension to John S. James;  
 H. R. 11916. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew B. Spurling;  
 H. R. 1685. An act granting an increase of pension to Augustus E. Hodges;  
 H. R. 1709. An act granting an increase of pension to Edwin J. Godfrey;  
 H. R. 12395. An act granting a pension to Ruth Bartlett;  
 H. R. 6023. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert L. Ackridge;  
 H. R. 12490. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Culbreath;  
 H. R. 3352. An act granting an increase of pension to Margaret M. Boyd;  
 H. R. 7613. An act granting an increase of pension to Evaline Wilson;  
 H. R. 4116. An act granting an increase of pension to William Berry; and  
 H. R. 4176. An act granting an increase of pension to Nathan W. Snee.

#### RECIPROCITY WITH CUBA.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Mr. Chairman, at length the discussion of the proposed measure has been precipitated into the House. I listened yesterday with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, who opened the debate, and was impressed by his comparison of the present relationship of the island of Cuba to the United States. He characterized it as that of a guardian for a ward. I do not think the illustration very apt. Indeed, I do not think the remedy offered is such as a prudent guardian ought to tender to a ward. I have known guardians to indulge their wards far beyond the rule of appropriate conduct. I have known guardians to do for a ward what they refused to do for their own offspring; and while I honor a guardian for performing his duty, nevertheless I assert that our first duty is to our own child—the offspring of our established policy. The first duty of the American Congress is to the American people.

Much as I dislike to disagree with the Committee on Ways and Means upon the question of our fiscal policy, sharp and pointed and unmistakable as have been the differences between us in this matter, still I desire to record my sincere belief that the committee and its honored chairman have been animated by the highest motives and the utmost sincerity in the course upon which they have finally resolved.

This is the people's forum. Here is constituted the court of public opinion. This is the only place in the national councils where the people may be directly heard without passing through the circuitous pathway prescribed by the Constitution for other governmental agencies.

Every Representative upon this floor bears his commission directly from the people, and he must soon return to give an account of his stewardship.

This is the place where many men of many minds mingle together for the common weal. Those from the East come laden with the responsibility of large and multiplied industrial development. From the West is gathered together the composite energy of all the failures and of all the successes, all the trials and all the hardships of the past, representing the most marvelous development ever seen in any age of the world's progress. From the North we bring rare industrial trophies and illimitable energy which has made for us a proud place in the national economy. From the South you upon the other side bring to us the sweet perfume of peace restored, industry rehabilitated, and happiness returned.

Are we not indeed fortunate in the period and the hour of our public service, and should we not with solemn devotion consecrate ourselves to the public good?

I would not for anything have you believe that we who for two months have been battling for what we believe to be right were animated by any hostility or unfriendliness toward the island of Cuba. Such is far from the truth. We have always aided and sustained her in her struggle for independence. We glory in her approaching sovereignty, and we hope that her Congress may always be loyal to the Cuban people, emphasizing their devotion to the new Republic by stainless private life and honorable public conduct; and while they may bear their share of the world's responsibility for public order and do their part to insure its stability and progress, yet they must not forget that they represent Cuba, and that her future development will be critically watched by all the world.

So, Mr. Chairman, we must not forget that while we may sympathize with Cuba, and are indeed akin to all the world, our first duty is toward our own people, and everything that tends to strengthen and develop our multiplied resources at home and add to the measure of our national strength and independence should be the object of our profoundest solicitude.

I am opposed to this measure because I believe it is calculated to breed strife and dissatisfaction with the other sugar countries of the world, which are thus discriminated against.

I believe it will have a tendency to provoke commercial hostility among the other West India islands and our neighbors in South America.

I am opposed to this measure because, in order to give it effect, it becomes necessary to violate a solemn promise of the Republican party deliberately made in national convention to the American people.

I am opposed to this measure because I believe it will be harmful to the agricultural and industrial classes of the United States, whose great interests have been confided to our care, and because I believe it will be harmful in the extreme to the island of Cuba.

I am opposed to this policy because I believe that the principal beneficiary will be the American Sugar Refining Company, which does not need our sympathy.

I am opposed to this measure because I believe that the people of the island of Cuba will receive no benefit therefrom.

And now that the shackles of servitude have been lifted from this patient island people, after so many years of turmoil and disaster, I wish for her a greater destiny than to become merely the producer of a single product, and that dependent upon the caprice of a single corporation.

The rugged pathway over which our nation has trudged to greatness and power had many natural impediments which were readily overcome by her as the necessities arose; but the flight to industrial supremacy has been made through storm and trial, frequently with pinioned wings, and always and ever with doubt and hesitation carping in our wake.

There was little doubt as to the wisdom of our early tariff policy. Indeed, there was rarely any doubt about it until manufactures were stimulated to such an extent that the South saw in the invasion of skilled and free labor a condition inimical to the permanent institution of slavery. At that time the attitude of the South changed, and they gradually taught themselves to believe that it was better to produce raw material and send it to Europe to be manufactured for the world.

The South never aimed at industrial independence, and has with singular unanimity until within very recent years urged that our tariff laws were both burdensome and unconstitutional. They believed that the duties exacted were added to the cost of the article protected, and it will be strange indeed if it is not reasserted as this debate progresses.

On the other hand, we believe that the tariff operates to enlarge the area of production and ultimately to decrease the cost to the consumer. Who can doubt that the tremendous development of the sugar industry, stimulated as it has been by tariff, bounties, and cartels, multiplying the volume a million fold, has had the effect to give to the consumers of sugar the world over this article of necessity at the minimum of cost?

No development of the world's production of foodstuffs has



been more rapid or striking than that of beet sugar. In 1854 the total crop of the world was 182,000 tons. Ten years later it had reached 536,000 tons, and ten years later, 1,219,000 tons, multiplying each decade until, in 1900, it had reached the enormous amount of 5,510,000 tons.

When my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania, sitting upon my right, first entered the House of Representatives, sugar made from beets grown upon the farm formed but 13 per cent of the world's total sugar crop, whereas last year it constituted 67 per cent of the total world's sugar. While my distinguished friend [Mr. Grow] has been serving the people of his State with great wisdom and constancy, the sugar-producing area of the world has shifted from the Tropics northward until the farmer of the temperate zone is fast growing to be the captain of this industry.

Our friends upon the other side of the Chamber can not argue that the tariff has been added to the cost, for the average price per pound has been lessened from 5.37 cents in 1871 to 2.49 cents in 1900. I can remember distinctly paying 15 cents a pound for sugar; to-day you get 20 pounds for \$1.

Artificially stimulated as it has been, the masses of mankind have reaped the benefit. While the world's population has no more than doubled in sixty years, its consumption of sugar to-day is more than eight times as much as in 1840. And while but a single factory in all the United Kingdom now refines cane sugar, all the others are exclusively occupied in preparing for the market the raw product of the beet farms of Germany, France, Austria, and Russia.

The American Sugar Refining Company refines the cane sugar sold in this market, and controls 90 per cent of the product. The beet-sugar manufacturer takes the beet from the farmer's hands, and when it leaves his factory is refined and ready for the table.

This is a struggle for supremacy between a gigantic and cold-blooded monopoly upon the one hand and the American farmer and sugar manufacturer upon the other. And I make the prediction that the struggle will be long and relentless and costly; and if we will give to the American sugar industry the same measure of protection accorded in all other fields of American enterprise, this sugar trust will lower its haughty head and deal fairly with the people upon whom it must depend.

Withdraw protection from this new and promising industry, discourage and weaken it by encouraging its rival, and when the epitaph is written upon its dismantled ruins, be very sure that your name does not appear among its principal offenders.

We bring you a rebate plan which has in it no threat to American industries. We bring to you a proposition which, if carried to its conclusion, will give a wider and better and far more reaching relief to the Cuban people than the proposition of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] in his speech upon this floor yesterday said he would do nothing that would affect unfavorably any American industry. He said this bill was not calculated to do the beet-sugar industry of our country any harm. But the testimony before his committee, of Mr. Atkins, of Boston, largely interested in the cane-sugar industry in the island of Cuba, is in conflict with the statement of the gentleman from New York.

Indeed, my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], who sits here on my left, said in one of the conferences—and I violate no secret—that if he thought this would harm an American industry it could not receive his support; and I do him the honor to say that I do not believe he would willingly harm a single American industry. But I ask him to reconcile the testimony of Mr. Atkins with the statement he made in conference.

Mr. Atkins says in answer to a question:

"Do you think it desirable for the Government to do anything to encourage the domestic production of sugar?"

"No; I do not."

Reconcile that with your protection principles, if you can. One of the men whose testimony you are guided by as to the necessity for this legislation does not favor American independence of foreign sugar supply. The gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from New York say that this concession will do the industry no harm. I ask you, gentlemen, my colleagues upon this floor, whom are we to believe? Are we to believe the man who does not believe in the domestic production of sugar, and therefore favors the pending bill, or are we to believe the members of the committee, who say that this action will do no harm? The situation is complex.

It reminds me of a story of two tramps who went to a house to beg something to eat. As they neared the premises a dog came fiercely out of the back door and up toward the two tramps, and one said to the other: "The dog won't hurt you, Jim; go to the door and ask for something to eat. The dog won't hurt you; don't you see he is wagging his tail." "Yes," said Jim, more discerning than his pal, "I see he is wagging his tail, but I also notice he's showing his teeth and snarling; I do not know which

end to believe." [Laughter.] So, Mr. Chairman, when gentlemen largely interested in the production of cane sugar in Cuba, our rival in the sugar markets of the world, tell us that they do not believe in any protection at all, and when the gentleman from New York yesterday admitted that 50 per cent reduction would not be too much to give to the island as a trade basis, and when I pressed the question upon him, admitted that free trade in raw sugar would be even more satisfactory than the present bill, may I hope to be pardoned if we look upon the whole plan with suspicion?

Mr. PAYNE. I think the gentleman from Michigan ought to distinguish which gentleman from New York.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I do not mean the gentleman who is now addressing me, but your colleague, Mr. McCLELLAN.

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, that's it.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Now, Mr. Chairman, I said a moment ago that we were not hostile to the island of Cuba. We believe in helping that island. We glory in its approaching independence. Our sympathy for Cuba takes a practical turn. Under your policy you simply afford a reduction of tariff to the few owners and exporters of sugar, while our policy would turn back to the government of the island of Cuba 20 or 25 per cent of the full revenue collected, relieve all the people of that island from the burdens of taxation, and assist it in its initial movement as an independent government. Our confidence in Cuba is greater than yours. The gentleman from New York yesterday in debate, turning upon me, asserted that when he made the speech in 1897 to which I called the attention of the House, he did it before the Spanish-American war. But every time there is a war must our fiscal policy be readjusted? The gentleman again turned upon me seemingly and charged myself and others here with the responsibility for bringing on that war.

Well, now, Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to avoid any responsibility for my action either preceding or during the Spanish war. But I say to the gentleman from New York that you may search my record in the Fifty-fourth and each succeeding Congress up to the present time in vain to find a single suggestion from me which warrants you in making such a statement. I never uttered a sentence upon this floor in favor of war with Spain; I never uttered a sentence upon this floor in the whole Cuban controversy except to advocate according belligerent rights to Cuba and to Spain, as we had the right to do under international law. So that my record upon that subject is as clear as the gentleman's.

I went to the White House as one of a committee of this House, informally chosen, to see the President, and there are men about me to-day who know what I said to President McKinley when he asked how I stood on that matter. I said to the President that while Michigan believed an end should be put to that war, while we believed in carrying out the principles laid down in the St. Louis platform in giving independence to the island of Cuba, yet I was one who wanted him to know that I would not urge him to go one inch farther or one minute faster than he thought it wise and prudent to go. Gentlemen sitting about me will bear out that statement. While others went further, I was conservative.

But, be that as it may, I have no desire to evade the responsibilities of the Spanish-American war. I believe that we have rid this hemisphere of a most disturbing affliction. I have no apology to make for it here or any place else. We believe in the future of the island of Cuba. We believe that it possesses unrivaled possibilities. We are willing and anxious to do something for it, but I ask you, sir, if it is wise for us to change our policy merely to meet a temporary exigency of a foreign state? If you start out on a proposition of that kind, you will instantly involve your country in jealousy with other West India islands and South American republics; you will instantly involve yourself with other great European sugar-producing countries, and possibly violate the most-favored-nation clause of treaties by favoring this one sugar-producing country of the Western Hemisphere. For one, I do not propose to engage in any such undertaking. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, much was said yesterday about the utterance of President McKinley at Buffalo. I defy the gentleman from New York or any member of the Ways and Means Committee to point out a single sentence of William McKinley in his Buffalo speech which gives you any warrant whatever for the measure now before the House of Representatives. I will tell you what he said in that memorable and God-inspired utterance, which will live forever as his parting message to the American people.

By sensible trade arrangements which will not interrupt our home production we should take from our customers such of their products as we can use without harm to our industries and labor.

Will this "interrupt our home production?" Every sugar interest in the State of Michigan says it will. Will this interfere with industry and labor here? Ask the farmers and laborers in the sugar fields of Michigan and California.

I contend, sir, that reciprocity treaties should be so framed as

not to interfere with American industry, and I stand on the speech of President McKinley; I stand upon the national platform of the Republican party; and that platform in 1900 said:

We favor the associated policy of reciprocity, so directed as to open our markets on favorable terms for what we do not ourselves produce.

We produce sugar; we will produce more sugar if you will but give us the encouragement you promised [turning to Mr. PAYNE].

The Republican party has always kept and redeemed its promises. Our greatest statesmen saw a few years ago that upward of a hundred million dollars was being annually sent out of our country to purchase sugar. They had confidence and faith in American capacity to produce this article. The Agricultural Department of the Government sent experts all over the world to study the secret chemistry of the soil. Seed was distributed to whomsoever would experiment with it. Our national faith was pledged to give it a fair and honest trial. The Republican platform of 1896 boldly said:

We condemn the present Administration for not keeping faith with the sugar producers of this country. The Republican party favors such protection as will lead to the production on American soil of all the sugar which the American people use, and for which they pay other countries more than \$100,000,000 annually.

In the Republican campaign text-book of 1900, issued by the national committee, quoted from by every speaker in the land, there appears the following:

No subject interests the farmers of the United States more than that of the possibility of their being able to supply the hundred million dollars' worth of sugar which our people consume annually, and some facts which have recently been presented show that they are fully justified in their ambition.

The farmers of the country have been encouraged by the Republican party in their ambition to produce the sugar of the country. It was a distinct promise to the farmer that he need not fear that the Republican party would permit the cheap labor and cheap sugar of any tropical territory to be brought in in a manner which would destroy the infant industry of beet-sugar production which the farmers of the United States have, under the fostering care of the Republican party, been building up during the last few years.

The lamented Mr. Dingley, with whom we had the honor to serve, said with his unerring wisdom in the discussion of the tariff act which bears his name:

Nothing can be done to so successfully clip the wings of the sugar trust as to develop our beet-sugar industry, and at the same time confer immense benefit on our farmers and all our people.

While the distinguished chairman of the Committee upon Ways and Means in the present Congress, while that bill was under discussion, advocated establishing a beet-sugar factory in every Congressional district in the United States, assuring us in his own well-chosen language:

We will not disturb our tariff in the next quarter of a century.

And the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] in the same debate said:

There is not a rate of duty, not a principle of tariff taxation, that has not been protested against by the sugar trust and fought to the bitter end before the Ways and Means Committee. We propose that instead of sending \$125,000,000 a year to the foreign countries of the world, most of which goes to pay labor in the production of sugar, we will make it possible for every pound of sugar that we want to be produced in the United States of America. The Republican party comes and offers to the agriculturist of this country this magnificent boon. We will protect the industries of the country in all directions from further demoralization; and we ask you to turn aside hundreds of thousands of acres of the splendid lands of all these States from the production of corn and oats and wheat and potatoes and cotton to be put into an already overstocked market, to the production of sugar, and give to the farmers upon the farming lands of this country a better market with less competition than they now have.

Mr. Chairman, the great States of Michigan and Wisconsin, California and New York, Colorado, Utah, Oregon and Montana took these distinguished statesmen at their word; had faith in the promise of our party declaration. Upward of twelve and a half million dollars has been invested in the sugar industries of Michigan. More than 20,000 farmers heard the bugle blast of the gentleman from Ohio, and are to-day under contract cultivating the sugar beet. At the time you spoke, sir, there was not a sugar factory in the whole State of Michigan. Now there are ten in successful operation. And if you will but recall this measure and give the assistance to Cuba which we all desire to give in another and simpler way, not involving a change of the policy of our Government, ten new factories will be completed this year.

I know it is claimed that this cut of 20 per cent will do our present factories no harm; but, Mr. Chairman, when the Dingley law was passed and you invited us to engage in this business you did not say that you would even agitate a change in the tariff, much less reduce it by 20 per cent.

But I do not need to refresh the gentleman's recollection by turning to the utterances of anyone but himself. In the testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means Mr. Carey, an expert sugar man, was asked by General GROSVENOR:

Is it possible, in your judgment, to make a concession to Cuban sugar that will benefit the Cuban people and still not injure the production in the United States of cane and beet sugar?

And the answer of Mr. Carey was:

I do not think anything about it; I know that it is not.

And Mr. GROSVENOR replied:

Nobody could help knowing that who knew enough to put two and two together.

[Applause.]

I ask the gentleman from Ohio whether he has suddenly changed from his attitude of hostility, which that remark disclosed, to one of general approval of the subject under consideration?

The fact that it will do harm must be admitted when you realize that it will benefit our rivals. Men who have engaged in this industry are frightened and alarmed. Banks and financial institutions are disturbed by the agitation of a reduction and by the call for a further and a larger cut. Loans are difficult to obtain, securities have been impaired, danger lurks in the principle you would have us adopt to-day.

Is it not the height of political wisdom to make our country independent of foreign sugar supply? Fifty years ago the consumption of sugar per capita was but 22 pounds. Last year it was 68 pounds per capita. The growth of our country, the increase and multiplied uses to which sugar will be put will some day, and not far distant, equal an annual expenditure of \$200,000,000. What a tremendous drain that will be upon the resources of the country. How absolutely inexcusable if our policy should result in the destruction or the permanent impairment of this industry.

If we were in ignorance of what could be accomplished by a consistent and American course, there might be some excuse for doubt and hesitation and even a change of policy. But within the lifetime of every man upon this floor domestic industry has been stimulated and our country made independent of a European supply.

How recently the late President, then Congressman, McKinley was jeered upon this floor because he dared to advance the theory that a tariff of 2.2 cents a pound upon tin plate would stimulate its manufacture here. At the time he made the statement there was not a pound of tin plate being produced in the United States, although there was and had been for years a revenue tariff on tin plate of a cent a pound. What a din of incomprehensible noises filled the air after the enactment of this measure! Misrepresentation seemed to be the principal avocation in every community. Housewives laid in a supply of tin dishes in order to take advantage of the price before the bill went into effect.

We were expending in Wales \$20,000,000 every year for tin. There are men upon the other side of this Chamber to-day who did not believe that tin plate would ever be manufactured in the United States as the result of the McKinley law.

Prior to its enactment we imported 650,000,000 pounds annually from Europe. The first year of the law we made in America 13,000,000 pounds of tin plate, the third year 139,000,000 pounds, the fifth year 304,000,000 pounds, and in 1900 there was manufactured in the United States 1,000,000,000 pounds of tin plate.

[Applause.]

We no longer send our money abroad for the employment of the laborers of Wales. Twenty-three thousand American citizens now labor daily in the tin mills of our own country, while upwards of \$15,000,000 is annually paid to them in wages.

Are you proud of your prediction? Do you enjoy the distinction which you have attained as a political prophet? This vast army of laborers in the tin mills of America are the patrons of the carpenter and the bricklayer and the mechanic and the farmer of our own country, stimulating every community in which they labor.

My distinguished friend from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD] and myself had the pleasure, in the last campaign, to personally inspect a modern tin-plate mill near my own home, and I can not tell you the joy I felt when I realized for the first time how effective had been the policy of the noble and lamented McKinley.

[Applause.]

You will be as proud, my protectionist friends, over the sugar industry of the United States, and the benefits will be a thousand times more far-reaching if you will but give it the same full measure of protection as was given to the tin industry of our country.

I am opposed to this policy urged by the committee, because I deem it the height of unwisdom to change the economic policy of our country, where a large and growing industry is affected. Cuba does not need our sympathy. She may well profit by our wisdom and our example. She needs to be encouraged in the principles of Government best calculated to her largest development.

I think if we encourage her to become merely the producer of sugar we will do her infinitely more harm than good. You may ask what I would recommend. Possibly there is no wisdom in the suggestion, but, Mr. Chairman, if I had my way I would propose to the first congress of Cuba that she follow the wisdom of the early fathers of the American Republic and put about her rich possessions a protective tariff which would develop the multiplied resources of the territory and stimulate the people into the diversified avenues of commerce and industry. [Applause.]



Let her drink from the fountain of political wisdom, where we found our most cooling and refreshing drafts.

Cuba is rich in resources, specially favored by climate, with harbors unsurpassed. I think too much of her to consign her to the permanent fate of cane-sugar production, which makes her labor semislave, and will keep the standard of her citizenship very low.

She has virgin forests with a rich and rare variety of woods. She has iron and copper undeveloped and unexplored. The mountainous end of eastern Cuba is most highly favored and will produce lemons equal to the Mediterranean shore between Marseilles and Genoa, and is one of the finest regions for coffee culture in the world, particularly between Santiago and Guantanamo and from Cape Maysi to Baracoa, on the northern side.

I long to see Cuba rich and prosperous. I paid my first visit to the island when the reciprocity of Mr. Blaine was at its height. I know the condition of her people then and never shall forget as long as I live the thrill of satisfaction I felt when I saw American flour piled upon the wharves at Habana, Matanzas, and other ports. I thought then that reciprocity with Cuba was most desirable, and I think so now, whenever it can be accomplished without injury to the domestic industry of the United States, but I do not believe that any exigency exists in the affairs of Cuba which warrant this radical departure from the policy of our Government, so long established, and I do not believe that the late President McKinley in his last utterance, so full of wisdom, ever intended that the reciprocity which he approved was to be other than in perfect harmony with our protective policy. He always stood solidly upon the Republican platform, which in 1900 declared:

We favor the associated policy of reciprocity so directed as to open our markets on favorable terms for what we do not ourselves produce, in return for free foreign markets.

I have said that I did not believe the condition of Cuba was such as to call for this sacrifice of domestic industry. According to the evidence before the Committee upon Ways and Means, all the labor of Cuba is employed at higher wages than are paid the farm hands of Michigan and Minnesota. According to the report of the War Department just made, the export trade of Cuba, which in 1899 amounted to \$37,435,296, in nine months of 1901 amounted to \$52,861,672, an increase of over 40 per cent.

While Cuban exports have increased, her imports have decreased, indicating a very healthy condition of affairs, and in nine months of the last year she shows a net balance of exports over imports of \$4,244,858.

Truly there is no indication of distress in these figures. The agitation must have found its origin away from the island of Cuba. What kind of distress think you would cause the sugar product of Cuba to increase from 300,000 tons in 1899 to 615,000 tons in 1900, and to over 800,000 tons in 1901, without any modification of our tariff laws?

It is said the Cuban people would be benefited by a reduced tariff duty upon sugar. I can not bring myself to believe this is a true statement. Governor Wood says that 450,000 tons of raw sugar are now stored in the warehouses of Cuba. At \$70 a ton the value of this sugar would be \$31,500,000.

Whom do you suppose owns it?

Take 20 per cent off the duty and in my opinion the sugar trust will pocket \$2,916,000 in the twinkling of an eye. Reduce the duty 50 per cent, as some tariff reformers, like the gentleman from New York [Mr. McCLELLAN], urge us to do, and the owners of this sugar would pocket \$7,290,000. Take the duty all off, as the free traders of our country would have us do, and the owners of this stored sugar would pocket \$14,580,000.

Much sympathy has been worked up for what is styled the "poor Cuban," but, Mr. Chairman, the "poor Cuban" is employed at as high wages as he will receive if the tariff is lowered.

Who is it that has the greatest motive for advocating this reduction of duty?

I do not consult the possible prejudices of men for my conclusions, but I turn to the last annual statement of Mr. Havemeyer's benevolent aggregation, known as the sugar trust, and I find on December 31 last they reported their assets at \$122,551,777, an increase of \$12,380,198 over the assets of the preceding year; and turning to the details of the account I find that this increase grows out of the following situation:

"In 1900 the American Sugar Refining Company had on hand \$22,488,790 worth of raw sugar unmanufactured, while on December 1 just passed they had on hand \$12,248,640 worth of raw sugar unmanufactured, a decrease of \$10,240,150. Does this not account for the failure to sell on the part of the Cuban planter described by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE]?"

The New York Journal of Commerce, eager as it is for Cuban relief, is frank enough to say that the item of sugar which shows the decrease as above stated, would seem to indicate that the sugar trust has been "carrying a smaller amount of raw sugar

than usual at this season—a move that finds explanation in the anticipated reduction of duties on Cuban sugar by Congress."

No wonder that Mr. Pepper, in his letter to the Evening Star, under date of March 13, says the shipments of sugar from the port of Habana amounted in the week then closed to but 6 sacks (1,920 pounds), not enough to keep the sugar refiner busy for one minute.

Are you so blind that you can not see why this gigantic corporation is carrying so little raw sugar and the purpose it has in view? Are you unwilling to believe that the chief beneficiaries of this reduction will be the sugar trust, which the gentleman from Ohio says opposed the sugar tariff to the bitter end when the present schedule of rates was adopted?

Cuba can produce sugar cheaper than any other country in the world. The French Journal of Commerce says the island has a capacity of upward of 5,000,000 tons, more than twice the capacity of the people of the United States to consume.

When competition has been stifled, when the production of beet sugar has received its final deathblow, who, let me ask you, is the master of the trade in this great article of necessary use? The company organized for the purpose of refining the raw cane sugar of the Tropics. Think you they will not recoup the loss which competition and expensive development have made necessary in order to dispose of a promising rival?

The pathway of the sugar trust is strewn with the wrecks of its competitors, and, oh! what a monopoly this company will enjoy when a false public sentiment, based upon a false foundation, enforces further reduction and gives this company the greatest sugar market in all the world for its domination.

I commend to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. PAYNE], who honors me by his presence, the attitude of Congressman McKenna, now a justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, who took the same view then that Mr. TAWNEY and Mr. METCALF, of the committee, take in the present Congress. Mr. McKenna, then dissenting from the sugar schedule of the McKinley law, said:

Protection as understood politically is the clear right of all industries or none. The bill (McKinley) in its schedule makes an arbitrary and invidious distinction between the sugar industry and other industries. The Republican House of Representatives should not set this example. Who can say where the contagion will stop? The beet-sugar industry is not only suitable to the circumstances of the country, but of all the range of protected industries not one offers such a brilliant prospect for good. Must an industry be able to supply the home consumption before it is entitled to protection? Protection must be universal, it must be national, or not at all.

Justice McKenna, dissenting from the Committee on Ways and Means, thus stated our position, at a time when there was not a single beet-sugar factory in the entire State of Michigan, if indeed there was one in the United States. We have brought this industry into life by republican doctrine. Do you propose to cripple it at the very threshold of its development?

I do not blame the Democratic party for its hostility to the tariff in the past. You then had reasons for being hostile. You valued slavery then more than manufacturing industry with well-paid free labor. From your view that position was necessary before the war, when much of your wealth was in slaves and free white labor would have caused you trouble; therefore you opposed the imposition of a tariff, calculated to diversify the products of the country and make it all that God intended it to be.

But the South is changing somewhat upon that question, to which I am glad to testify. Still, there are not a sufficient number who can get away from the old prejudices to come out squarely for protection, and we are obliged to force prosperity upon them. We always believed that our country should be independent of the world, that the protective principle would diversify our products, and it has succeeded admirably in so doing. Mr. Chairman, we look for little help from the Democracy. For my part, no alliance has ever been made or attempted with the Democratic party to defeat this measure or to help the position of the minority upon this side. We are protectionists. We believe in the doctrine of protection. In that respect you, my friends, are 20 per cent nearer the Democratic party than we are. [Applause.] We believe in the doctrine of protection. I wish you and your associates would help us repel this assault.

This morning while coming to the Capitol with a distinguished hold-over Democrat of the Cleveland Administration, who occupies one of the most prominent positions in the Government service, he said to me, "How are you coming out in your sugar fight?" I said to him, "I hope we will win. Are you with us?" He said, "No, I am not with you." I said, "Why?" He said, "I am a free trader, and this bill tends in my direction."

We are protectionists. We are not reconcentrados; we are not insurgents; we stand for Republican doctrines; we follow the leadership of that arch protectionist, the lamented McKinley. We take this occasion to say that it is a poor time for you to compromise with the tariff reformers of our country. They have been battering at the walls of protection since hard times have disappeared. They ridiculed off the statute books the



great measure of protection advocated by William McKinley. They drove him from his seat in Congress by misrepresentations. Now do not adopt their policy; do not compromise with error. If you do, you will have a public sentiment in the country in favor of tariff revision which you can not stem or stay until agitation has worked havoc with our industries. We would stay it now. We would stay it with your help; but we would stay it, if we can, without your help. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I said a moment ago that you were throttling this industry at the very threshold. I repeat it. Is there a man on this floor to-day who will not admit that a reduction in the tariff will encourage our rival in the sugar industry? Is there a man on this floor who does not know that to pass this law will stimulate Cuba in sugar production? If it will not stimulate that island why are you passing it? And right here I propose to dissent from the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] yesterday that the consumer pays the tax. If the consumer pays the tax, why in heaven's name has not the exporter in Cuba sent his product over here to be consumed? He is holding it because he knows he will be obliged to pay more to get through our custom-house than he will have to pay if your proposition goes into effect.

And I deny the general principle that the consumer pays the tax. That is an old Democratic dogma. It has been worn threadbare in the campaigns of the past. Let me ask you if we to-day put a tariff of a thousand dollars a ton upon steel rails, would the price of steel rails to-morrow be a thousand dollars a ton? Nonsense! Such a price would increase production almost without limit until the price of rails would fall far below the tariff. I deny the proposition that the tariff is added to the cost and has to be paid by the consumer. Why, Mr. Chairman, protection is based upon the principle that it will enlarge the area of production. If we enlarge the area of production and multiply the product the price falls and the consumer is benefited.

Take the article of sugar, for instance. When bounties were placed upon sugar in Europe there was very little sugar produced. In 1840 there was only 1,150,000 tons. In 1900, 8,800,000 tons was produced in the world. I ask you whether the price is higher to-day than it was when we began to protect sugar? Gradually the cost has been reduced. We have increased the volume and we have thereby decreased the price, as we did with tin plate. If somebody in the Fifty-sixth Congress had proposed to take the tariff off tin plate, is there a man on this side of the Chamber who would have voted for it? No; because you have stimulated the tin-plate industry of America to a point where to-day we are supplying all that we consume. [Applause.]

But the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] said yesterday that there was 450,000 tons of raw sugar now stored in the warehouses of Cuba waiting to be exported to this country, and I rose for the purpose of asking him who owned the sugar. He evaded the question. Who does own the sugar? Let me remind him again of the annual report of the American Sugar Refining Company, just made public, which shows the amount of raw sugar on hand to be much less than last year at this time.

Now, tell me, gentlemen of the Ways and Means Committee—I will give you the opportunity if you will rise—tell me whether the American Sugar Refining Company have not purposely avoided buying raw sugar in Cuba to inflame public sentiment in that island and public sentiment in America in favor of a reduction of duty? If that is the case, who will be the beneficiary of their course? Clearly that company. Are you prepared to do this? Are you prepared to thus demonstrate your benevolent interest in the sugar trust, whose principal owner says he knows nothing about ethics, and if it costs money to destroy competition he will make it up later by increasing the price?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Yes, sir.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman says that he is opposed to this bill, because the benefit would go to the sugar trust. I will ask the gentleman if he will stand with us and reduce the differential duty that the trust gets?

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Does the gentleman favor taking the duty off refined sugar of the world?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say that if an amendment is offered that I think is germane—

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Rules and an able parliamentarian. Do you believe that would be germane?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I believe that one can be prepared that will be germane.

And now I ask the gentleman to answer my question.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I will answer the gentleman by asking him this question: Do you believe that an amendment is germane to take the duty off refined sugar of the world?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I believe that an amendment proposing to take off the duty on refined sugar coming from Cuba, or other parts of the world through Cuba, is germane.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. There is not an ounce of refined sugar that comes from Cuba. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If you want to raise the question you can do it in that way.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I will cross that bridge when I get to it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman wants to strike at the differential duty, it could be accomplished in that way.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I will not say to the consumer of sugar in America that we are going to do him any good by taking the duty off refined sugar from Cuba when there is no sugar refined on that island. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman stand on the proposition that he will not strike at the duty that the trust gets, when he pretends here that we are legislating for the trust? I will ask the gentleman to answer that question.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Not if I believe it to be germane.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have just stated that a motion to strike the differential off the duty on refined sugar that comes from Cuba, no matter where it is imported from into Cuba, coming from Cuban ports, would be in order.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I do not know a single agent of the American Sugar Refining Company in the world. I do not know whether there is one in the galleries of this House now or not; but if he were in the gallery and heard the proposition of the gentleman from Alabama, he must have an expansive smile upon his face equal to that of the gentleman from Alabama, in his pleasantest mood [laughter and applause on the Republican side], because the gentleman knows that that would not affect the sugar trust at all, and would not avail us anything.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think you can reach the trust in that way.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Will you give your indorsement to that proposition?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If it comes from Cuba I certainly should. Will the gentleman vote for that?

Mr. COOPER of Texas. I will state to the gentleman from Michigan that there are some Democrats who will vote for it.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. If I believed it parliamentary, I might do so.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think you will have that opportunity.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I shall watch the gentleman's vote with a great deal of interest.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. And I will do the same by the gentleman from Michigan. [Laughter.]

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Mr. Chairman, my friends of the Ways and Means Committee are exceedingly solicitous about the conditions of the island of Cuba. I know something about the conditions of the island from personal observation. I was there during reciprocity ten years ago. I was upon the great sugar plantations of Cuba when prosperity was at its height.

When I returned I had the proud pleasure of an hour's interview with Mr. Blaine, the author of our reciprocity treaties. I believe in reciprocity to-day, but I believe in the reciprocity that does not involve the surrender of the principle of protection.

I again visited Cuba just after the *Maine* went down. I know something of the suffering of those people. I saw the reconcentrado in his camp. I saw the farmers herded upon the Los Focos in Habana and fed like animals. I saw in one ward of the city of Habana more than 8,000 orphan children, many with the marks of the machete upon their heads; and I saw people starving to death by the thousands. Fifteen people died in one day in the doorway of the governor of Matanzas. I saw little children in the last stages of starvation, swollen to such proportion that they looked more like animals than human beings. I sympathized with Cuba then, and I am interested in her to-day. I would do for her more than the gentleman from New York offers to do by this bill.

Let us see about her condition. Cuba is in a transition period. She is passing from military rule to independence, and yet she shows an increase in her export trade of 40 per cent this year. Why does she need our sympathy? The balance of trade is in her favor over \$4,000,000. She is in healthful condition; there is no distress in the island. Labor is all employed at wages better than are paid to the farm hands of our own country. Their sugar output is at its highest point. Would they have increased this output had they not been in a prosperous condition? What caused the increase? Why, the American planters who have gone in and made their investments, the Havemeyers, the Atkinses, men of enterprise and intelligence who have gone down there for that purpose.



I ask you whether this is inimical to our sugar producer? I ask you if it does not threaten his existence? Cuba is the richest spot in the world. It can produce more sugar than any similar area. She has a capacity so great that the sugar producer of America must give up the moment you strike down the barrier. Only one-tenth of the land of Cuba is under cultivation.

I know it will be urged that the American sugar manufacturer might better take this small cut, which will not affect the price of sugar one way or the other, rather than run the chances of annexation.

But in answer to that argument I desire to say that the question of the annexation of Cuba has no terror for the American sugar manufacturer. You throw around that island the strong arm of our Government, make it a part of our territory, guarantee to it the same stability that is guaranteed to every State in the Union, and the island of Cuba will soon be populated by ten million people. Industry will be diversified and resources developed, instead of being merely the producers of sugar the island will be a hive of multiplied industry, the land that now produces sugar cane at a small profit will at that time produce garden stuffs, cereals, and fruit to supply the tremendous demand of her increased population.

While Cuba may become a competitor in other fields of industry, the standard of her citizenship would be immediately raised; her ambition, hopes, and expectations would be confined only to the limitations of the National Union. [Applause.]

Her people would go into the forests, virgin and illimitable. The labor that annexation would drive to Cuba would force the owners of land to cut it up into small farms, to be used in the production of cereals, vegetables, and fruits, profitable at their own doors.

So, my friends, we are not terrorized by annexation. But we want responsibility to precede bounty.

If you will but encourage the farmers of the West to go on growing beets for the manufacture of sugar, you will do for future generations incalculable good; you will diversify the products of the farm in such a way as to bring the price of agricultural lands to the maximum value.

Mr. Chairman, in the State of Michigan we have 20,000 farmers raising sugar beets. They are under contract; they are getting a fair price. Curtail sugar production in America, put a premium upon the business of their rivals, and you instantly cast a gloom over the beet producers. Michigan has a great interest in this question. Michigan believes in the policy of the Republican party. Michigan was the birthplace of the Republican party and has never withheld her electoral vote from our candidates, and our delegation refuses to stand by the grave of a single unredeemed promise of that party. [Applause.] We believe in keeping promises inviolate.

There are men in this gallery who put their money into the sugar industry of Michigan pleading for protection. There is not a drop of water in the capitalization of the sugar-beet industry of Michigan. Every dollar invested is bona fide. Do not drive them from this industry by inadequate protection.

We can at least keep our party pledges. We can at least do what we promised the country to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BISHOP. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have thirty minutes more.

Mr. LANDIS. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to conclude his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BISHOP] asks that his colleague be permitted to proceed for thirty minutes. The gentleman from Indiana amends by asking that the gentleman from Michigan may be permitted to conclude his remarks. Is there objection to the latter request?

There was no objection.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Mr. Chairman, if we will keep this protection on, if we will not disturb the sugar industry, it will soon require 3,788,540 acres of farm land to produce the beets which are required for sugar making. It will give to the farmer \$98,000,000 a year for the crop, and the invested capital will aggregate, if it does not exceed, \$745,000,000. The consumer will very soon get the benefit of it.

Give the same measure of protection to the sugar industry of our country that you did to tin, and you will have a product here so large that we can supply the American market for future generations and keep at home the vast sums of money which we have formerly sent abroad.

But I hear people say that the Platt amendment is in the way of Cuban development. I deny it. I have examined the Platt amendment with great care. There is not a line of it which prevents Cuba from making trade arrangements with any country in the world with whom she ever did a dollar's worth of business.

If I am wrong, I ask some member of the Ways and Means Committee to rise and tell me wherein I err. There is not a line of that law which deprives Cuba of a single market she ever enjoyed before the amendment was passed. Indeed, she is privileged to go into the markets of the world. She is there now. Spain is one of her patrons. What we did say in the Platt amendment was that she should make no treaties which should involve her sovereignty—a vastly different proposition.

Cuba will be free soon, as free as the laws of our country and the Monroe doctrine will permit her to be. But, Mr. Chairman, it is false to say that we are depriving her of any great advantage in the world's market. I deny it. I hurl it back as an untruth. It will not stand the test of verity here nor in any legal forum of our country. It is not true. Our Government has done nothing to limit her rights abroad. But the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LONG] and others will say our national honor is involved. When did we guarantee the prosperity of Cuba? When will our responsibility end? National honor! Read the platform of our party. Read the text-book issued by the Republican campaign committee of 1900 where they distinctly say to the farmer of America that he need not fear that the Republican party would permit the cheap labor and the cheap sugar of any tropical territory to be brought in in a manner which would destroy the infant industry of beet-sugar production in the United States which the farmers of the United States have, under the fostering care of the Republican party, protected and brought into life. [Applause.]

Here your national honor is involved. Guard it well.

We are not insurgents; we are the regular protectionists of our party. We stand upon our platform; we stand upon our principles; we are consistent; we are guided by the past, and look forward to the future with bright hopes and anticipations; we adhere to the party policy.

You are departing from it to give her a little boon for sixteen months, chaining her hand and foot while you feed her gruel from a spoon for a brief period of infancy. Why do you not give her better advice? Suppose that advice had been given to our country in its early history. What think you Washington, Jefferson, and Hamilton would have said? They would have said, "Our possibilities are greater than that." They would have said, as they did say, "Protection will develop and multiply the industries and resources of America." Protection would develop and multiply the industries and resources of Cuba. Do you want her independent? Give her a fair policy. Do you want her to prosper? Do not chain her hands. Do you want her to be truly independent, or are you preparing her for statehood in the Union?

Mr. Chairman, the greatest political wisdom that our country has ever received was gathered from the West India Islands, the birthplace of Alexander Hamilton, who first gave effect and form to the policy of protection; whose wisdom should still rule us, and should be ever present in our deliberations. Give them the advice which Hamilton gave to us and you will make Cuba truly great and truly independent.

I long to see Cuba rich and prosperous; I long to see her independent. I want her proud company in the family of nations. But if you make her a carrier of water and a hewer of wood; if you confine her development to a single industry, you make Cuba a dependent people.

But, Mr. Chairman, I can not bring my argument to a close until I emphasize my entire dissent from the growing tendency of the people, now in the very height of their prosperity, to again attempt the reformation of the tariff.

Our factories are now humming with the rattle of busy looms. Our forges glow with furnace fires. The ports of our commerce stir with the pulses of enlarged trade, and improvements in city, town, and hamlet are adding to the beauty and utility of the land.

Is it not strange indeed that so short a time has elapsed between the abject poverty of our people and the unrivaled prosperity of the present? And yet there are people and journals urging that the time is now ripe for a general revision of the tariff. They hold that the organization of trusts is the natural outgrowth of protected industry. There never was a more fallacious and false statement made by men of wisdom and discernment.

Mr. Havemeyer said before the Industrial Commission that the tariff was the mother of trusts. If that be so, tell me how it happens that free-trade England has more trusts within her Empire than America with all its protection. [Applause on Republican side.]

I do not believe that the gigantic corporations now massing their wealth into single industries need protection for their stockholders. Indeed, I am almost of the opinion that they possibly might be better off without it.

I do not stand in this honored place as the representative of any of these corporations. I stand here to plead for the preservation of the American wage scale in the interest of the happy home of the toiling millions of our laborers.

You strike down the tariff upon iron and steel and the international trust, with headquarters in London, will supply the product of steel and iron to the world.

Which scale of wages think you will be the measure of remuneration given to the labor of that trust?—the American scale or the European scale?

For the preservation of the American scale I stand here to defend the tariff against its false friends. The laborer is the principal beneficiary of our policy. He has no capital except the willingness to labor; that he may use his capital to the best possible advantage, that he may patronize his fellows in other walks of life, that he may educate his children, acquire his own home, humble though it may be, that he may enjoy the comforts, and, indeed, some of the luxuries of life, is the only apology I make for holding unflinchingly to our great protection policy. [Applause.]

I have heard it stated that the leaders in this House and in the Senate desire to enter the coming Congressional campaign with a united party. So do I. You can unite your party for Republican principles; you can unite it for a sound currency; you can unite it for a protective tariff; you can strike it in twain by half-hearted devotion to either principle. [Applause.]

I have no patience with the desire upon the part of the false friends of protection who are constantly parading the volume of our foreign commerce. Much as I value it when it comes without the surrender of our domestic market, still it is as a drop of water in the great ocean when compared to the fabulous market at our own door.

The grand total of our industrial output amounts to over \$20,600,000,000 in the year just closed. What proportion of this vast volume of our annual vitalized energy finds expression in the export trade of the United States? Barely \$1,400,000,000 worth of the products of agriculture, mining, and manufactures.

While it is well to have foreign trade, we must never neglect for one moment the cultivation and maintenance of our larger and greater and more important domestic market. [Applause.]

The prosperity of all the people of our own country must be the object of our undivided solicitude. It is for this that our battle in this instance has been waged. It is for this that we temporarily part company upon the wisdom of this measure.

Keep the tariff on in the interest not of capital alone, but of labor. I plead for the interest of the laboring man. His capital is the muscle of his strong right arm. He must use his capital on the instant or never use it at all. The merchant who has no customer for his wares can store them upon his shelves. The manufacturer may carry his products for a month or for a year, but the laborer can not store his wares. He must sell his time upon the instant or never sell it at all. All things else in nature, except time, are yielding to the genius of man. Death can no longer silence the voice, for the living tones may be preserved in the phonograph.

The old saying that "the mill will never grind with the water that has passed" must be dropped from the list of aphorisms, for the wonderful progress of electrical science has enabled us to stand by the side of the cataract, gather the power of the falling water, store that power, send it across the ocean, and a year later turn a wheel with the force thus appropriated and preserved. But neither God nor man can stay the course of time. Time stands by the dial of the universe, and as the minutes are ticked off he gives them to those who grasp them; but left unclaimed they pass unused, unfruitful, unyielding into the night of the unreturning past. Because labor is thus helpless it is the first to feel the effect of a reduction of values and the last to get the benefit of an inflation. Lower tariffs will flood this market with imported goods, and down will go the price of labor as falls the mercury on a winter morning.

Mr. Chairman, I protest against a revision of the tariff. I protest against the demoralization of our present business prosperity. I protest against the return to a period of certain depression. Prosperity is now upon every hand. Labor is happy with his task to perform; capital is unrestrained in its quest for new ventures.

Gentlemen upon this side the chamber, you would unite us; we would gladly join you. But I ask you to go to the sacred archives of the Republican party, take out the banner of protection so often carried to success on fields of political controversy, wave it proudly above your heads as the signal to fall in; lead on; lead on; and we will follow you. [Applause.]

The leaders of the ancients used to be so solicitous about their followers that they carried urns upon their shoulders burning with perpetual fire. By day the smoke could be seen and they knew where the leaders were. By night they could see the flame and were kept in the true course. Gentlemen upon this side; leaders, if you please; light up the urn of political wisdom. Illuminate the principles of Hamilton, of Lincoln, and McKinley, and

we upon this side will follow you. Lead on! Your destiny shall be our destiny, and united we go to certain victory. [Prolonged and long-continued applause.]

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, for the first time since I became a member of this body I find myself opposed to a large number of Republican Representatives, and to some of the leading members of that party, on a measure of general public concern. Under these circumstances it is proper that I should give to the House the grounds of that opposition.

I know that our situation in relation to Cuba is difficult and perplexing, and I am ready to admit, and admit freely, that as to the measures by which that situation should be met men may differ widely and differ honestly and honorably.

It is well to review briefly the history of this measure as it has developed and is now presented. All of us know the literary campaign which has been made with great vigor and persistence from the beginning of this session. In the month of December and January there was scarcely a day when members did not find in their mail pamphlets and other forms of printed matter setting forth the conditions of distress which it was claimed existed in Cuba, contending that we were under obligations of duty and honor and also of self-interest to do something to relieve these conditions, and pointing out a method by which those obligations could and should be discharged.

There was such a uniformity in the method proposed, namely, by an agreement between our Government and that of Cuba about to be organized and put into operation, of which the principal factor was a reduction in duties on the products of Cuba, of which sugar and tobacco and cigars are the principal ones, coming into the United States and a corresponding reduction by Cuba on our products going there, as to arouse a suspicion in some that there was something more beside humanity and philanthropy and patriotism behind this literary propaganda, and that perhaps it was being carried on by certain selfish and sordid interests; and we did not have far to go to guess which was the chief and foremost of such interests.

This constant and widespread agitation was arousing in the country a sentiment that something must be done for Cuba. The cry was, Do something for Cuba. And there appeared here in Washington representatives of those interests which might be affected by the proposed legislation, some advocating it, others opposing any action.

Recognizing this growing sentiment, and also prompted by certain suggestions contained in the message of the President, and the report of the Secretary of War, the great committee of the House—the Committee on Ways and Means—very properly, as I think, determined to hear from the various conflicting interests, and to gather, as far as possible, from all available and reliable sources the existing facts, so that they might intelligently deal with the questions presented. The result of those hearings is before us in a printed volume of more than 700 pages, which I hope by this time is more or less familiar to the members of the House.

From the facts developed by that investigation these questions arise: First, are the conditions in Cuba such that any concession from us, or agreement between us and them, if gentlemen prefer to put it that way, is needed; second, if such concession or agreement is needed, shall it be made, and third, how shall it be made?

Those claiming that such concession or agreement should be made do so on the ground, first, that it is absolutely necessary; that unless it is made universal bankruptcy and anarchy will before long prevail in Cuba; second, that we are bound in honor and good faith to make it by reason of the relations between us and Cuba which have grown out of the war, and particularly the Platt amendment, and third, that it should be done because of the advantages which will come to the United States by reason of the increased trade and consequent commercial benefit which will result.

I shall not allude to the tobacco industry in Cuba. It seems to be conceded on all hands that this is in a flourishing and prosperous condition and likely to remain so. I shall speak only of the sugar situation, for I look upon this as a sugar question only.

For my part I am not at all satisfied that such an agreement or concession is necessary for the welfare of Cuba. The evidence shows that there is no distress now in Cuba. Everybody is employed, and at higher wages than are paid in the same industry in Louisiana. Note what Colonel Bliss says:

I have not spoken of distress except to deny that any existed, so far as I know. It is a long time since I have seen anyone begging on the streets or anyone who wanted work who was not at work at good wages.

We were told that relief must come by the 1st of February, and certainly by the end of that month, or else universal ruin and bankruptcy would prevail and anarchy would reign; and yet the 1st of April has come and gone and still Cuba is prosperous and her industries are going on; no distress, no bankruptcy, no ruin,



And all of us have read from the correspondent of the Washington Star, an ardent advocate of concession or agreement, that—

Things have been exaggerated, that nobody is starving in Cuba to-day or need starve, nor need anybody starve next year.

The chief distress from which they seem to be suffering is the exaction by the Spanish usurers of from 10 to 25 per cent interest on the money they borrow upon which to do business, and if any benefit should go to anybody save the sugar trust from this measure it would in all probability be principally to these Spanish shysters. The whole argument of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] was based on the assumption that it costs 2 cents a pound to produce sugar in Cuba, and yet the most reliable testimony, as I think—that of Mr. Saylor—was to the effect that it could be produced at a cost of a cent and a half per pound. This gentleman investigated the conditions there in 1898-9, and he is a man in every way qualified to speak, and his conclusion was that it could be produced at that cost. He was asked if the increased cost of labor since then would not make it more now, and he said he thought not; that while their labor had advanced in wages the improved conditions in the country and their better organization and machinery would make up for that, and that he thought one would about offset the other. The gentleman from New York stated that sugar was to-day worth about 1.81 in Cuba and had been for some time. If that is true, and sugar can be produced there for a cent and a half, the Cuban would now make a profit of 31 cents a hundred pounds—a pretty fair profit. I have no doubt any newly organized beet factory one or two years old would be satisfied with that profit.

Nor am I satisfied that we are bound by any moral obligation growing out of the war or the Platt amendment to make this agreement. We have given to Cuba that for which her people made a heroic struggle and endured untold misery and hardship—liberty and freedom from the Spanish yoke. For this we have spent hundreds of millions and have given thousands of noble lives. We have relieved her of millions of dollars annually in taxes to Spain and from a bonded indebtedness of hundreds of millions which Spain would have put upon her. We have restored order where chaos reigned. We have established government and administered it with an honesty and efficiency which will serve as an example and model and guide to the new republic. We found her the home of disease and death. We will leave her the abiding place of health and pleasure and beauty.

But they say we have deprived her of her markets, destroyed her industries, and, by the Platt amendment, tied her hands so that she can not negotiate and establish favorable commercial agreements. We have done no such thing. We have always been Cuba's best market—practically her only market for sugar—and we are to-day her best market, and her only sugar market. There is scarcely to be found a parallel for her industrial, especially her agricultural, revival since the war. Let anyone examine her sugar production—in 1897 something more than 200,000 tons, this year 850,000 tons. Peace and plenty are on every hand. Let anyone examine the Platt amendment. The benefit is theirs, the burden is ours. There is no control whatever over her commercial treaties and agreements. There is no control over her at all, save that she shall not endanger her independence or contract debts she can not discharge.

It is also claimed that we have promised to establish and maintain a stable government, and that without commercial prosperity this can not be done, and that therefore we must establish and maintain commercial prosperity. We undertook to pacify the island and pledged ourselves when that was completed to leave Cuba and its government to the people of Cuba. By the Platt amendment we reserved the right to intervene to preserve her independence. Nowhere have we agreed to guarantee commercial prosperity or a stable government. We do not make any such guaranty to any State in the Union, and ought not to. Surely we could make none such to a foreign country.

It is also claimed that the relationship of guardian and ward has existed between us, and from that has sprung this moral obligation. As guardians we were bound to a faithful, honest, and diligent administration of the estate. This we have given. As I have shown, we found that estate heavily encumbered and in a condition of utter wreck. We have put it in order and cleared off every incumbrance and are ready to turn it over to the ward a magnificent inheritance. With this we are ready to send him on his way rejoicing.

It would seem, then, that we have in the fullest measure discharged every obligation to Cuba, and that when next month we turn the island over to her people we will exhibit to the world an example of faithfulness and generosity which finds no parallel in recorded history.

But be all this as it may, I for one am willing, if there is any question about it, to do more. Let us admit, for the sake of the argument, that we are in honor bound to relieve her from present embarrassments, if any such exist, and let us admit, for the

sake of the argument, that such embarrassments do exist. Let us also admit that we can and will secure advantages in trade which will be of value to the United States. I am not willing to extend that relief and secure these advantages in such a way as to injure or destroy one of our own industries, or to violate the promises we have made to our own people. And this brings me to the proposition now under consideration.

The Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee after the hearings asked for a conference of Republican members of the House and sought advice upon a measure which they had not all agreed upon, but which was the proposition commending itself under all the circumstances to more of the members of the committee than any other proposition. In the fewest words it was this, that we should enter into an agreement with Cuba by which we should grant to Cuba a reduction of 20 per cent in our tariff rates on articles coming from Cuba in consideration of equal concessions to us on articles going from the United States to Cuba, and also upon the condition that they should enact our immigration and exclusion laws. After repeated conferences and long discussion this proposition was found to be unsatisfactory to a majority of the Republicans, and so it has been modified and has taken the shape in which it is now presented. The modification is that the agreement and its operation shall extend only to the 1st of December, 1903.

I was opposed to the original proposition. I am opposed to the modified proposition, and I think I shall be able to show before I conclude that it is worse than the original one.

Let us first consider the original proposition. I was opposed to the proposition. First, because I do not believe it would accomplish the object sought to be accomplished.

If the evidence before the committee on behalf of those favoring tariff reduction is worth anything the amount of reduction proposed is entirely insufficient, and if I understood the gentleman from New York [Mr. McCLELLAN] correctly on yesterday that was the burden of his argument. With one accord the witnesses testified that nothing less than 50 per cent would do at all, and some of them thought that free sugar alone would be satisfactory. In this view, as to the 50 per cent, General Wood, in his letters and interviews, has concurred, and Mr. Palma, the president-elect of Cuba, in an interview, which has probably been sent to every member of this House, used these words:

It is impossible to improve the bad condition of our principal staple—sugar—by reducing the American duty only one-third. In that way the problem will not be solved at all. The clamor for further reduction will continue. \* \* \* Therefore it is absolutely necessary that the concessions should reach 50 per cent of the actual duties, so as to give the producer a reasonable gain.

Now, if this be true, not only will this reduction fail to relieve Cuba, but it will only serve to continue the agitation and will thus, as I shall show further on, discourage and retard, if it does not entirely arrest, the further development of an important American industry.

But a reduction of duties, whether great or small, will fail of its object, because it will not inure to the benefit of the Cuban planter, but will in all reasonable probability be absorbed in whole or in part by the American sugar refiners, or what is commonly known as the "sugar trust."

Whenever any legislation involving the sugar schedule of our tariff laws is proposed, at once the forbidding and overshadowing form of this colossal combination appears. And it is no mere specter or creature of the imagination conjured up by those who know its power and fear its evil influence, but is a real, substantial, and potential presence. And it must be considered and reckoned with. That the American refiners are practically one body crops out everywhere in the testimony. I call attention to the testimony of Mr. Armstrong, a sugar broker of New York, and who is therefore certainly acquainted with the facts as to this. On page 78 of the hearings he testifies as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. Is it not a fact that during the past three years the margin between the raw sugar and refined sugar has been much smaller than during the two or three years preceding? For instance, before 1897 was it not a cent and a quarter, and since 1897 has it not been reduced to fifty-one one-hundredths, say last summer?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That is owing to conditions, which I will have to explain to you. Before 1897 there were times when it was 1½, and there were times when it was even more, but probably it averaged about a cent. Something over a year or two years ago there were one or two independent refineries built, and war broke out between the sugar trust and the independent refineries and the trust broke down rates to a very low point for the sake of knocking out those one or two refineries, and when that was accomplished prices advanced again, and when you take the average of all that time you get the fifty-one one-hundredths.

The CHAIRMAN. They have knocked out the independent factories in the last two or three years?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes, sir; they bought them out.

The CHAIRMAN. They bought them all out except Arbuckle?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. There is the National Refining Company, which suffered with the others. I believe now they operate together.

The CHAIRMAN. They all operate together now, so the only regulator of the refined sugar is the beet sugar interests?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes, sir.

But if anyone still doubts this, I also invite his attention to the



statement of Mr. Havemeyer before the Industrial Commission in the testimony before the committee.

Again, I call the attention of members to a table on page 578 of the hearings. By this table it is shown that in the year 1901 Cuba sold in the American market 500,409 tons of sugar and in the markets of all other countries but 73 tons. Besides, the testimony shows that by reason of export bounties and the cartels which prevail in the sugar-producing countries of Europe the European sugar producer is able to sell his surplus; that is, what he has left after supplying his own country—and he has his own market preserved to him by absolutely prohibitive duties—below the cost of production, and therefore the Cuban has nowhere to go with his sugar except to America.

Again, I call attention to the testimony of Mr. Atkins at the bottom of page 1 and the top of page 2 of the hearings. He there states that there is in the world to-day more than 1,500,000 tons of sugar over and above the world's consumption. In other words, a supply in excess of the demand of more than 1,500,000 tons.

Now, what do these facts prove? The Cuban has an article to sell of which the world's supply is largely, enormously in excess of the demand. He has but one market—the American market—in which to sell that article. Suppose in that one market there were a dozen buyers, is it necessary to make any argument to show that, within wide limits, those buyers would be able to dictate prices. Could not those buyers say to the Cubans, we will pay so much for your sugar, and if you will not take that, why we can and will go to Germany or France and buy what we need? It surely can need no argument to show that this would be the situation.

But when we go a step further and suppose that in that one market there is practically one buyer, and that one buyer the sugar trust, will members ask themselves the question what the result would be then? Will not this buyer be able to absorb this reduction in duty, and if he can absorb it will he do it? Is this great combination actuated by considerations of benevolence, or morality, or humanity, or philanthropy? If there is any member who is so—I was about to say foolish, but I will say credulous and charitable as to believe that, I again invite his attention to the statement of the head of that combination before the Industrial Commission. And if it is not actuated by these considerations, what consideration is left? There can be but one—its own profit and gain. And how will it reap that profit except by taking to itself the whole or a part of this reduction?

But aside from these general considerations we have the highest authority in this House—none other than the Ways and Means Committee—for stating that the sugar trust will absorb and appropriate to its own profit the reduction in duties. And I have no doubt if the tables were turned and these gentlemen stood with me on this proposition they would be making the same argument I am making. Here is a report made from that committee, a unanimous report of the majority, a Republican majority, composed largely, almost entirely, of the same members who compose it now. This report was made on the 26th of May, 1900, by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], but he is no more to be held responsible for it than are the other members for whom he spoke. It was made upon a resolution offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON], providing for the admission free of duty of sugar from Porto Rico and Cuba. I read from that report:

Following that abortive effort comes this resolution, and if this resolution should pass it would place upon the free list the molasses and sugar hereafter to be imported into the United States from Cuba and Porto Rico. The present product of Porto Rico amounts to something like 60,000 tons for this year, and would not be a very considerable sum of money, but when there is included in this proposed addition to the free list of the country the product of Cuba the item becomes an enormous one.

Following is a table of the imports of molasses and sugar dutiable from those two places, and the entire importations from all countries classified in proper order:

Imports of molasses and sugar, dutiable, year ended June 30, 1899.

Articles.	Total, United States.		Cuba and Porto Rico.	
	Quantities.	Value.	Quantities.	Value.
Molasses..... gallons..	5,806,256	\$789,084	5,077,703	\$390,399
Sugar, not above No 16 Dutch standard:				
Beet..... pounds..	723,336,352	15,269,307		
Cane..... do.....	2,731,868,574	60,714,089	770,346,000	18,907,773
Sugar, above No. 16 Dutch standard..... pounds..	62,745,703	1,692,951	5,427	159
Total..... do.....	3,517,950,689	77,676,437	770,351,427	18,907,932

Cuba and Porto Rico furnished 24.5 per cent of the total importations of cane sugar imported in quantity, and 31.1 per cent in value.

The average rate of duty on cane sugars not above No. 16 Dutch standard was equivalent to 74.31 per cent ad valorem, and the total amount of duties collected on such sugar imported from Cuba and Porto Rico in the year ended June 30, 1899, was \$14,010,366.11. The average rate of duty on sugar

above No. 16 Dutch standard was equivalent to 75.7 per cent ad valorem, and the total amount of duty on such sugar imported from Cuba and Porto Rico in that year was \$120.36. \$14,010,366.11 ÷ \$120.36 = \$116,386.47, the value of Mr. Richardson's proposed yearly gift to the sugar trust, calculated on the importations of 1899, which, of course, will steadily increase from year to year.

By this it will be seen that "Cuba and Porto Rico furnished 24.5 per cent of the total importations of cane sugar imported, and 31.1 per cent in value," and that to now place these commodities upon the free list of the country would, if the same amount of sugar and molasses should be imported during the current year beginning July 1, 1900, and running forward, give to the importers of sugar and molasses something like \$14,000,000. This would be a free gift from the people of the country, and measures the value of the proposed yearly gift to the sugar trust, calculated on the importations of 1899, which, of course, will steadily increase from year to year.

There is probably no commercial organization or trust with a more thoroughly well-organized and self-defending capacity than is the American Sugar Refining Company, and it must be borne in mind that there is no sugar refined in Cuba, or, if any, only the merest trace or small quantity, and that all cane sugar unrefined that comes from that country, or substantially all of it, is received and refined by the American Sugar Refining Company or, perhaps, one of the kindred organizations, which were stated by the great manager of that company to be "under the same umbrella" with the sugar trust.

In other words, if sugar were allowed to come in free from Cuba, the sugar trust would absorb the whole reduction. Now, if with free sugar from Cuba the sugar trust could take to itself the whole benefit, is it possible to escape the conclusion that they could absorb a 20 per cent reduction?

But there is other evidence of absorption by this combination of at least a part of the benefits which were intended for others.

Here is a table on page 578 of the hearings, prepared by the statistician of the Agricultural Department, which gives the average wholesale prices per pound during the year ending June 30, 1901, the last fiscal year, of sugar free on board at the port of shipment in Germany, Porto Rico, Cuba, and the Hawaiian Islands. These prices are as follows:

Sugar not above No. 16 Dutch standard (raw sugar).

	Cents.
From Germany (beet sugar).....	2.2
From Porto Rico (cane sugar).....	3.4
From Cuba (cane sugar).....	2.4
From Hawaii (cane sugar).....	3.9

I have also here a statement from the Treasury Department showing that the raw sugar imported from Germany during that year was practically all 88° rendement, or 94½° by the polariscope. I have also a statement from the same source showing all the sugar imported from Porto Rico during that year, the different degrees, and the number of pounds of each degree, and the prices. A calculation shows that the average was 92½°, and the average price, as above, 3.4 cents per pound. I have not been able to get a similar statement as to Cuba, but I have been able to get statements which go to show that Cuban sugar has a higher average, a little above 95°. The speech of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LONG] before the Republican conference shows that it averaged in the month of January, 1902, more than 2½° higher than Porto Rican sugar.

I have also a statement from the same source that the average polariscopic test of the sugar imported from Hawaii to San Francisco was 96.7°. This is perhaps too high a general average for Hawaiian sugar, although I am informed that Hawaiian sugar is of very high grade. It is safe to say that it is 96° and a little over. I have also a statement from the same source of the freight rates per hundred pounds, as follows:

	Cents.
From Hamburg to New York.....	8
From Porto Rico to New York.....	12
From Cuba to New York.....	8
From Hawaii to San Francisco.....	15

The hearings show that cane sugar is more valuable to the refiner than beet sugar, and I have made inquiry of the most reliable expert and scientific source in the Government departments as to the difference in that value, so that I may give it fairly and conservatively in the figures I am about to make. I learn there that cane sugar is worth about 10 cents per hundred pounds more to the refiner than beet sugar, degree for degree.

The hearings show conclusively, and nobody here can or will deny it, that the German or Hamburg price fixes the price the world over and that all comparisons should be made on that basis.

Sugar from Germany had to pay here a countervailing duty to offset the export bounties. Sugars from Porto Rico, Cuba, and the Hawaiian Islands had to pay no countervailing duty. Sugar from Hawaii paid no duty. Sugar from Porto Rico paid in 1901 15 per cent of the Dingley rate. Sugar from Germany and Cuba paid the full Dingley rate.

Now, with these facts before us, let us see what was being done in the year 1901 by the American buyer—the sugar trust—as to sugar coming from these countries. If the trust was paying all it ought to have paid to the sugar producers of Porto Rico, Hawaii, and Cuba to put them on a parity with the Hamburg prices, the equations for the different countries ought to have been as follows:

For Porto Rico.—Price at San Juan + freight to New York + duty + greater value to refiner = price at Hamburg + freight to New York + countervailing duty + duty.



For Hawaii.—Price at Honolulu + freight to San Francisco = price at Hamburg + freight to New York + countervailing duty + duty + greater value to refiner.

For Cuba.—Price at Habana + freight to New York + duty = price at Hamburg + freight to New York + countervailing duty + duty + greater value to refiner.

Putting in the figures per hundred pounds, we have the following:

For Porto Rico.—\$3.40 + \$0.12 + \$0.23 + \$0.05; total, \$3.80 = \$2.20 + \$0.08 + \$0.27 + \$1.63; total, \$4.18.

For Hawaii.—\$3.90 + \$0.15; total, \$4.05 = \$2.20 + \$0.08 + \$0.27 + \$1.63 + \$0.25; total, \$4.43.

For Cuba.—\$2.40 + \$0.08 + \$1.65; total, \$4.13 = \$2.20 + \$0.08 + \$0.27 + \$1.63 + \$0.15; total, \$4.33.

Thus we see that in no case do the two sides of the equation balance as they ought to do when we put in the figures. The difference for Porto Rico is 38 cents per 100 pounds, for Hawaii is 38 cents per 100 pounds, and for Cuba is 20 cents per 100 pounds. In other words, we see that the American buyer, the sugar trust, was paying to the Porto Rican 38 cents per 100 pounds less than he ought to have paid on all of the sugars brought from that island to New York during the fiscal year 1901, to the Hawaiian 38 cents less per 100 pounds on all the sugar brought from those islands to San Francisco during the fiscal year 1901, and to the Cuban 20 cents less per 100 pounds on all the sugar brought from that island to New York during the fiscal year 1901.

Again I call the attention of members to the statement of Mr. Leavitt, on page 250. The German has to pay a countervailing duty to get his sugar in; the Cuban has to pay no countervailing duty. The Cuban sugar should, therefore, have a margin of 27 cents per hundred pounds over German sugar delivered in New York. That statement shows that on that day, January 21, 1902, somebody was taking that margin which ought to have gone to the Cubans and 4 cents besides.

Now, will some member guess who was taking to himself these amounts which ought to have gone to the Porto Rican, the Hawaiian, and the Cuban? Can there be but one answer? If some member will make the calculation he will see that it runs into the millions of dollars.

Thus it will be seen that I have demonstrated, with the exactness of a theorem in Euclid, as far as such a thing is capable of demonstration, that the sugar trust could absorb or take to itself this reduction, and that it has in other cases been doing that very thing, in part at least. I think it entirely probable that the figures do not make it as bad as it actually has been.

But there are other circumstances which it might be well to consider. Why are the representatives of the sugar trust here, and why have they been here from the beginning of the session, if the Cuban is to get the whole benefit of this reduction? In that event, what interest have they in it? And why should they be here? That they are here urging this reduction we are all satisfied. We have the highest authority for believing so, none other than the most distinguished and prominent member of this House. Here is his letter to one of his constituents. He says:

Those contending for Cuba want a reduction of 50 per cent or a clean sweep of duties between us and that country. Contending for this doctrine is, first, the American sugar trust, which is here in the person of its ablest managers.

Again, here is a statement from the last report of the sugar trust, showing that they had on hand on the 31st of December, 1901—last December—more than \$10,000,000 worth of raw sugar less than they had on hand the 31st of December, 1900. Why should they thus run down their stock of raw sugar unless it was that they were waiting for this reduction to go into operation? And why should they wait for this reduction unless they expected to profit by it? Surely the trust knows its business. The New York Journal of Commerce, a paper that is strongly advocating reduction, has this to say about it:

The item of sugar, raw, unmanufactured, etc., is given at \$12,248,640, a decrease of \$10,240,150. From this it would seem that the company has been carrying a smaller amount of raw sugar than usual at this season, a move that finds explanation in the anticipated reduction in duties on Cuban sugar by Congress.

How innocently and strangely they deny their own doctrine, if it is the relief of the Cuban only that they are concerned about.

Let members scan the witnesses who appeared for reduction. Almost without exception the Americans amongst them have some connection, more or less close, with the sugar trust, or some of its members or officers. Is this mere chance? Let any member answer that to himself sincerely and frankly. Ah, gentlemen, the great-hearted, generous American people want to help Cuba, not this combination.

And yet from the foregoing considerations it would seem to be impossible to escape the conclusion that this combination will be the principal beneficiary of reduction. And they know it, whether others do or not.

Now, if this be true, I am ready to state a second ground on which I am opposed to this reduction, and it is a good Republican ground. It is because it will injure and prevent the further development of an American industry—an industry just beginning

to show that growth and development which we all hoped and predicted for it in 1897 when we passed the Dingley tariff law.

I have here a statement from the Agricultural Department showing that up to the year 1897 there had been established and put in operation only 6 beet-sugar factories. Since then the number has increased to 42, and 8 are in process of construction, making 50 in all. The product has increased from about 40,000 tons to 185,000 tons the year just closed, and if a sufficient quantity of beets could have been obtained and the factories could have been operated to their full capacity that product would have been very much greater.

Besides, there were during the last year 83 projects for the establishment of beet-sugar factories in various stages of organization and capitalization.

I will put in here a statement, compiled principally from the hearings, pages 571 to 574, giving the figures in reference to this industry.

Beet-sugar factories established and put in operation up to the year 1897, 6. These, together with those established since, make a total of 42.

As to these factories we have the following statement:

Invested capital in factories, equipment, and grounds.....	\$30,000,000
Annual amount of beets purchased..... tons.....	1,875,000
Annual cash paid for beets purchased.....	\$7,500,000
Annual coal consumed..... tons.....	202,500
Annual cash paid for coal.....	\$787,500
Annual lime rock purchased..... tons.....	150,000
Annual cash paid for lime rock.....	\$300,000
Annual operating capital employed (per annum).....	\$5,000,000

Beet-sugar factories in process of construction, 8. Beet-sugar projects in various stages of organization and capitalization, 83.

#### REQUIREMENTS.

These 83 factories would require:

Investment.....	\$49,000,000
Working capital.....	9,000,000
Beets purchased from farmers.....	14,700,000

#### REQUIREMENTS FOR HOME CONSUMPTION.

It would require 500 factories having a daily capacity of 500 tons of beets to produce by the time they could be put in operation all the sugar we would consume outside of what we get from the State of Louisiana, the Hawaiian Islands, and Porto Rico.

#### REQUIREMENTS OF THESE FACTORIES.

Invested capital.....	\$250,000,000
Annual amount of beets..... tons.....	18,750,000
Annual cash paid farmers for beets.....	\$75,000,000
Annual coal consumed..... tons.....	2,625,000
Annual cash paid for coal.....	\$7,875,000
Annual lime rock purchased..... tons.....	1,500,000
Annual cash paid for lime rock.....	\$3,000,000
Annual operating capital employed.....	\$45,000,000

In addition to this vast sums for coke, mill supplies, labor, transportation, etc.

From all this it can be seen that if the beet-sugar industry should continue to grow and develop as it has done in the past three or four years, since the passage of the Dingley bill, it would in a very few years supply, along with the sugar from Louisiana, Porto Rico, and the Hawaiian Islands, all American territory, the entire demand of the American people.

Now, the product of the American beet-sugar factory is white granulated sugar—that is, sugar of a grade equal to the refined sugar of the trust. It is, therefore, a competitor and rival of the trust, whose business it is to refine raw sugar, and is its only competitor and rival in this country.

If this industry should grow sufficiently to supply the American demand, and the Louisianans, and Porto Ricans, and Hawaiians should refine their own sugar, as they would do but for the overshadowing power of the trust, the sugar trust would have to go out of business. The sugar trust has just begun to realize that the beet-sugar industry, if allowed to continue to progress as it has done in the past two or three years, will put an end to its career of greed and extortion, and is therefore anxious to do, or to see done, anything that will injure it.

The result is that the trust is engaged in an unceasing and relentless warfare against this industry. We can well understand what that warfare means at the present stage of development in the beet-sugar industry when we recollect the almost complete monopoly which the trust has of the American market and the enormous profit it is and has been making. What these profits are anyone can calculate who will remember that we consume about 2,400,000 tons each year and that the trust refines it all with the exception of about 230,000 tons and makes a profit of about one-half a cent a pound. He will find that those profits amount each year to nearly as many million dollars as it would cost to build new the entire plant of the trust. It is these profits which has enabled the trust to water the stock of plants which could all probably be reproduced for \$25,000,000 to \$30,000,000 and pay each year enormous dividends thereon.

It is these profits which have enabled the sugar trust to go into the territory where the beet-sugar producer finds his market and



sell sugar for 3½ cents per pound—that is, at a price which would cause a loss to the trust and also to the beet-sugar man—while at the same time it was selling in other parts of the country for 5½ cents per pound.

It is the unceasing and relentless warfare of the trust that the beet-sugar producer fears and ought to fear. It is in this that his chief danger lies. If, therefore, a reduction in duties on sugar coming from Cuba would add to the already enormous profits of the trust, as I have shown it would, we would by granting that reduction be adding strength to the arm, and placing an additional weapon in the hand, of the trust with which to strike and cripple and crush the beet-sugar factory. Let gentlemen here make a calculation. If the importations from Cuba should be 800,000 tons of 2,000 pounds each, and the evidence seems to indicate that it might reach 850,000, and if the trust should take to itself only one-half of the reduction, we would by this legislation be making them an annual present of \$2,696,000.

From what I have said it is impossible to escape the conclusion that the sugar trust can, if it will, absorb the whole of a 20 per cent reduction made to Cuba, and that it will, as it has done in the cases I have stated before, absorb a part of it at least. If it should take to itself one-half of it, we will be making an annual present to that combination of more than two and a half millions. When we take this out, and also that part which might go to absentee Spanish landlords, and to the Spanish usurer, and to those Americans, most of whom are more or less intimately associated with the sugar trust or its officers, and who, instead of investing their money at home in America, are now exploiting Cuba for their own selfish purposes and crying out to the American people in the name of God and humanity, what will be left for the Cuban planter and laborer proper?

Now, if this legislation shall have the effect to stimulate Cuban production by these American commercial soldiers of fortune, these American syndicates which have gone to Cuba to invest their money instead of investing it at home, or if it shall put additional millions into the already bulging pockets of that commercial buccaneer, Mr. Havemeyer, and his trust, or if it shall have both of these effects, what must be the inevitable result to our domestic sugar industry, especially the beet-sugar industry? There can be but one answer.

Will not the power of the trust to go into the territory of the beet-sugar people, and put prices down to a ruinous figure, while they are entirely maintained elsewhere, which they have done with full duty-paid sugar from Cuba, be augmented by many millions? And if this is true, will not those beet-sugar factories already established, in the face of such tremendous difficulties, have those difficulties greatly increased? And will not the chances of profits to them be greatly diminished? Indeed, would not their profits be put practically at the mercy of the sugar trust? It seems to me there can be but one answer to these questions.

But there is a still more important consideration. What will be the effect on the further development of the beet-sugar industry now so promising? Would another company be organized or another factory built? With this reduction already granted, and agitation for still further reduction, would any prudent man put his money into such an enterprise? Would he not be little less than a madman to do so? Would not any man thinking of so investing his money say to himself, "This is but the beginning; I think I will put my money into something else." It seems to me there can be but one answer to these questions. The further development of the industry would be at an end.

Now, if these things be true, I am opposed, in the third place, to this legislation, because it is a clear violation of Republican platforms and principles and of a specific Republican pledge. I do not believe we as Republicans can, in good faith, in honor, support this legislation. Here is an industry—an infant industry, if we have one—not yet upon its feet, just struggling to its knees, just beginning to show signs of a healthy and vigorous growth, just at the period of its development when it needs all the protection and encouragement we have given it, not only as other industries have needed it, but also because of its life-and-death struggle with this great combination—an absolutely domestic industry from the planting of the seed to the marketing of the product—an industry in which farmers as well as manufacturers are interested, and which will be a great boon to the farmers. Gentlemen on this floor who favor this measure say this is no time for tampering with tariff schedules; that at this time of the most phenomenal and unexampled commercial and industrial prosperity that this or any other nation has ever known we can not afford to do that which may even by any possibility tend to weaken or destroy confidence; that even though some of our industries, like steel and glass and many others, have reached a strong and robust manhood, have come to that point when they defy competition with all the world, we must not touch their tariff schedules at this time.

With these gentlemen I agree, and with them I expect to vote.

But how can they reconcile their position with this legislation? How can they single out this little, weak, struggling, not half, not a quarter developed, just beginning to develop industry at which to strike a blow. I can not believe we can in honor take this step. Here is the platform on which we came back into power. Here are the pledges we gave to the people. I read from the tariff plank of our platform:

The ruling and uncompromising principle is the protection—

But this is not all; not only the protection of that part of an industry already existing. Ah, gentlemen, not that alone, but this—

and development of American labor and industry.

Mark the word "development." And this:

We condemn the present Administration (the Democratic Administration) for not keeping faith with the sugar producers of this country. The Republican party favors such protection as will lead to the production on American soil of all the sugar which the American people use, and for which they pay other countries more than \$100,000,000 annually.

Must we not in good faith, in common honesty, in honor, keep these pledges? Will we be keeping these pledges if we now strike at this industry—at this time, of all times? Look at the industry—beginning with 6 factories in 1897, and now 50 factories already built or in process of construction; more than 80 more in sight; a development just beginning to give evidence of a successful and enduring and complete establishment. Leaving out the question of those already established, should we arrest this development? Ah, gentlemen, there can be but one answer. How well I remember the great debate on the Dingley bill in the spring of 1897. That was my first session. Let me read from some of the great men:

Mr. THAYER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MORRIS. Well, I would prefer not, but I yield to him.

Mr. THAYER. I notice that the gentleman repeats with a good deal of pride the platforms of the party by which he was nominated and elected. I want to ask him if he is now repudiating the doctrine and policy of the great, peerless leader of the Republican party when he recommended to Congress and proposed a policy toward Cuba in these words:

In the case of Cuba, however, there are weighty reasons of morality and of national interest why the policy should be held to have a peculiar application, and I most earnestly ask your attention to the wisdom, indeed, to the vital need, of providing for a substantial reduction in the tariff duties on Cuban imports into the United States. Cuba has in her constitution affirmed what we desired, that she should stand in international matters in closer and more friendly relations with us than with any other power; and we are bound by every consideration of honor and expediency to pass commercial measures in the interest of her material well-being.

Mr. MORRIS. I will come to that, my dear friend, before I get through.

I was about to read what the great debaters in 1897, members of the Ways and Means Committee then and members now, said. I read:

[Mr. PAYNE, July 19, 1897; RECORD, p. 2749, first session Fifty-fifth Congress.]

What shall be done with the sugar trust? Well, I will tell you what, in my opinion, is the best way of dealing with it. Establish a beet-sugar factory in every Congressional district in the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.] Give competition, and lots of it, everywhere. Put the farmers over against the trust by passing this bill, and reduce the price of sugar so that German raw sugar can not be brought in to be refined here. Gentlemen on the other side, come over and help us, while we help the farmers out. [Laughter and applause.] You grangers over there, come and help us. You Populists that go up and down the streets day after day proclaiming your devotion to the interests of the farmers, help us out now when we are trying to help the farmers in this industry that we can establish so successfully. In this way you will do something toward demolishing the trust. You will accomplish more in this way than by mere invective—by running windmills and all that. [Laughter and applause.]

Why should we not produce all of our sugar in this country? Why, it costs us, Mr. Speaker, about one hundred millions. We were looking around for proper subjects for taxation. We knew that sugar would produce an enormous revenue; and besides all that, we knew that an adequate protective tariff would build up the industry in this country, and as it was gradually built up the revenue from that source will be reduced; by and by the revenue will come in more largely from other sources, and when this industry is fully established and revenue from sugar ceases, the reduction will keep pace with the increase. The thing will regulate itself; we will not disturb our tariff in the next quarter of a century. And then—

[Mr. Dingley, March 22, 1897, RECORD, p. 121.]

The duty on sugar has also been increased, both for purposes of revenue and also to encourage the production of sugar in the United States, and thereby give to our farmers a new and much-needed crop. We now pay foreign countries about \$84,000,000 for imported sugar, notwithstanding the abnormally low price, and this sum will soon be increased to \$100,000,000. The success which has attended the growing of sugar beets and the production of beet sugar in California and Nebraska in the past five years, not to mention the progress in the production of cane sugar in Louisiana, has made the problem of producing our own sugar no longer doubtful; and now that we must have the increased revenue from sugar for the present, a favorable opportunity presents itself to give this boon to our agriculture.

[Mr. GROSVENOR, March 24, 1897, RECORD, p. 240.]

We are going to force upon Louisiana that which she dare not ask for herself. Suppliant at the hands of Congress, with people representing not the claims and the clamors of her own people, we will force upon her the beneficence she dares not hope for or ask for herself. We will give to the sugar producer of Louisiana an opportunity to enlarge his products and turn over some of the



splendid lands of that beautiful State to the production of sugar, instead of corn, cotton, and other products of the soil; and so, Mr. Chairman, throughout Nebraska, through Kansas, and all of the States of the Union we propose to offer the same beneficent opportunities.

The Republican party comes and offers to the agriculturists of this country this magnificent boon. We will protect the industries of the country in all directions from further demoralization; and we ask you to turn aside hundreds of thousands of acres of the splendid lands of all of these States from the production of corn, oats, wheat, potatoes, and cotton, to be put into an already overstocked market, to the production of sugar, and give to the farmers upon the farming lands of the country a better market, with less competition than they now have.

[Mr. STEELE, speech on March 25, 1897, Appendix of RECORD, p. 123, first session Fifty-fifth Congress.]

With regard to sugar, I predict that if the tariff fixed by this bill is unchanged for a period of ten years we will at the end of that time be producing not only enough for our home consumption, but as much as we care to export, and at very little additional cost to the consumer. The farmers in the 20 States where the sugar beet can successfully be raised will reap a double benefit from the development of the sugar industry—first, because the sugar beet is a more profitable crop than wheat or corn, and, second, because the land devoted to raising beets will no longer be producing wheat and corn, and the lessened production will increase the price of these products.

This is what these gentlemen said then, and yet five years have not yet gone by, and they propose to begin to make charges. And they propose to begin on the very industry they promised to foster and protect, when relying on their promises and professions it has just got fairly started.

Gentlemen may answer by saying they do not believe these effects will follow. Can you afford, in the light of what I have said, to even take a chance of such effects?

Gentlemen may say this is reciprocity, and to that the Republican party is also pledged.

But this is not Republican reciprocity. Here is the Republican platform:

We favor the associated policy of reciprocity, so directed as to open our markets on favorable terms for what we do not ourselves produce, in return for free foreign markets.

This is not McKinley reciprocity. Here is what he said:

By sensible trade arrangements which will not interrupt our home production we shall extend the outlets for our increasing surplus.

This is not Roosevelt reciprocity—may his Administration be crowned with success. Here is what he said, and I call the attention of the gentleman from Massachusetts who interrupted me a moment ago to it:

And that reciprocity be sought for so far as it can safely be done without injury to our home industries.

Ah, gentlemen, this is not the kind of reciprocity for which Blaine and McKinley and the Republican party have stood.

The measure as modified is worse than the original one. It will satisfy nobody. It will not satisfy the Cubans, if those who have assumed to appear in their behalf before the Ways and Means Committee are to be believed. They have everywhere in the hearings contended that nothing less than 50 per cent would be sufficient. Already Mr. Palma, the President-elect of the Cuban Republic, has repudiated it. You have all seen his interview; I have it here. General Wood says it is entirely inadequate. Does anybody suppose it will satisfy the sugar trust? Instead of making them an annual present of millions for an indefinite period, as was at first proposed, it only makes that present for one year.

The distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LONG], in a speech before the Republican conference, to which I allude because it was published in full in the Washington Post of the next morning, based his argument in favor of concessions to Cuba on the ground that reciprocity with that island would be of great and lasting benefit to the United States. He knows, as does everybody here know, that before this agreement can go into effect certain things must be done. The Cuban government does not take charge until after the middle of May. There will be the usual formalities and the necessary delays of organizing the new government and transferring the island.

Then the Cuban congress must act. They must reform and enact their entire system of revenue and tariff laws so as to be able to make any concessions to us. They must enact our immigration, our exclusion laws, and our contract-labor laws. The Government must then proceed to negotiate the agreement provided for in this measure. And there are those who are now contending that they must also, before reciprocity shall take effect, embody the Platt amendment in a formal treaty with the United States. That treaty will have to be ratified by our Senate, and ratifications will have to be exchanged between the two Governments.

The gentleman from Kansas knows, we all know, that all these things will take time. We all know that it will probably be away along into next fall before all these things can be completed, and if the treaty referred to is to be made and ratified, it will be delayed until after the beginning of the next session of Congress, in December. And yet his committee brings in this bill providing that this agreement shall terminate on the 1st of December, 1903.

What kind of reciprocity will this be? Barely a year to run. Before our merchants and manufacturers could learn the trade of Cuba and begin to gain any advantage from the reciprocal concessions the agreement would be at an end. It is evident to those who are most concerned about reciprocal trade that for that purpose this measure will be wholly inadequate and ineffective. Already they are beginning to ridicule it, as well they may. Already those newspapers which have been almost as wild about this as they were about Porto Rico are beginning to say that the reduction must be increased and the time of its operation extended.

All this but goes to show that the agitation for reduction, instead of being put at rest, will only be increased and intensified. And it is this agitation which hurts. It is this agitation which has arrested and will continue to arrest the development of the beet-sugar industry. Already those who were about to let contracts for the construction of factories have called a halt, and it is safe to say that not another enterprise will be inaugurated until it is seen that this question has been satisfactorily and finally settled. I have here a letter from a gentleman in Michigan, Mr. Watts S. Humphrey, from which I will read an extract:

HUMPHREY & GRANT,  
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW,  
Eddy Building, Saginaw, Mich., February 17, 1902.

HON. PAGE MORRIS,  
Representative Chamber, Washington, D. C.

I have what I can earn from my business. I have subscribed for \$15,000 worth of stock in a sugar factory that is now being constructed. The contract was let prior to the time of this agitation in Congress. We are compelled to carry out our agreement. We have contracted for over 60,000 tons of beets at the old Michigan prices. We will pay for these beets delivered at the factory 2½ cents per pound for all of the sugar that will come out of them. At 4½ cents for granulated sugar only leaves 2 cents for the cost of production of the sugar by the factory out of the beets and as dividend to the stockholders.

Others who had formed their companies, but were fortunate enough not to have let their contracts when Congress convened, entirely stopped their operations, and before putting their money in will await the actions of Congress on this sugar question. You can see that we are caught, and are compelled to go on. I shall consider that I have been buncoed out of \$15,000 by the Republican party if they destroy this investment, and I know if you were placed in my situation you would feel as I do, that there is no excuse upon the part of the Republicans for any such treatment of the people who have invested their money in reliance upon the pledges and promises of this party.

Ah, gentlemen, would not any of us feel that way? Everybody will feel that this is a mere makeshift, a mere pretense of concession and relief, and that the agitation must go on. But for the assurance of the honorable gentlemen who compose this committee that they will not consent to any greater reduction I would be forced to the conclusion that they expected the reduction would be increased and the time extended at the other end of the Capitol, and that it was their hope and intention that it should be.

Under all these circumstances, is it not evident that this measure is un-Republican, unwise, and unpatriotic? And is not that conclusion strengthened when we consider that there is another method by which all that is sought to be accomplished by this measure can be accomplished, and accomplished much more completely and effectively, and without the danger of the evil consequences to which I have referred?

That method was proposed in the Republican conference. In the fewest possible words it is this: That we shall not reduce duties at all; that we shall continue to collect the full rate, and shall then for such length of time as may be necessary pay over to the Cuban government such portion of the amount collected as may be necessary to accomplish the ends sought; and that in consideration thereof we shall receive from Cuba such reciprocal concessions as she may be able to grant. By the method of the bill now before the House we give up a portion of our revenue by a reduction of duties; by this last method we collect the revenue and pay it over.

By this method we are not limited to 20 per cent. We may give whatever per cent may be necessary. We need not stop at the end of one year, but let it remain in operation for three years. During that period reciprocity can have time for effective operation. At the end of that time its value will have been demonstrated and we will be in position to act wisely for the future.

Let me here read the reasons assigned for that method which were given in the conference and published the following day:

1. It will afford relief both to the government and to the people of Cuba.
2. It makes certain that Cuba and her people, and no one else, will be the beneficiaries of our action.
3. By its adoption we keep faith with the people of this country and with the people of Cuba.
4. It does not violate our national party platforms of 1896 and 1900.
5. It does not disturb existing conditions in this country.
6. It does not alter or modify any schedule of the present tariff law.
7. It does not injure or discourage any domestic industry or prevent its further development.
8. It avoids an inopportune agitation of questions affecting industrial conditions of unparalleled prosperity.
9. It would secure reciprocal trade concessions from Cuba and give time to ascertain the value of such trade relations between the two republics under existing conditions.



10. Its reciprocal feature furnishes a consideration which makes the proposed measure of undoubted constitutionality. It is as competent for Congress to purchase trade concessions from foreign countries as to purchase naval or coaling stations.

11. It is sustained by precedent since the establishment of our Government, and particularly by the legislation refunding duties collected on the products of Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands.

12. It affords the means and opportunity for successfully inaugurating and permanently establishing the new government of Cuba during a time which the experience of all nations has shown will be its most critical period.

13. It affords relief until the present adverse trade conditions affecting the price of sugar shall have been improved by the abolishment of European sugar bounties.

14. It discharges every obligation assumed by us under the provisions of the treaty of Paris, the Platt amendment, and by our intervention to secure the independence of Cuba.

At the proper time I shall propose this method by way of an amendment to this bill.

But if the House is determined that there must be a reduction of duties on Cuban sugar, and nothing else, then surely there is something else that we ought to do. Let gentlemen remember that this means a reduction of duties on more than half the raw sugar we import from abroad, and that amount will probably increase from year to year. If we are going to give this advantage to the refiners, the sugar trust, then why should we not also reduce the duty on refined sugar?

Why should we not reduce the protection they now enjoy under the sugar schedule of our tariff law? Why should we not reduce or entirely abolish their differential? Indeed, why should we not, for the time at least, reform and remodel the whole sugar schedule? It is this differential behind which they operate free from foreign interference or competition. This is their intrenchment. Again I call attention to Mr. Havemeyer's statement before the Industrial Commission. I judge from his hysterics at the suggestion that it might affect his trust to some extent.

It is this differential which enables them to control the American market and put prices up or down between wide limits. It is this differential which enables them to carry on their war of extermination against all rivals. The highest experts assert that they have reached that degree of perfection in their organization and machinery that, if they would be satisfied with a reasonable return on the capital actually invested, they would not need this differential at all. Then why should it not be reduced or abolished?

What would its reduction or abolishment accomplish? It would bring them that much nearer to foreign competition. They are anxious for others to have such competition. Why not let them have a little experience of it themselves? It would curtail their power to control prices and slide them up or down at their will. It would in a measure destroy their power to make war upon their rivals and competitors. This alone would be an incalculable advantage to the beet-sugar industry, an advantage which would more than offset the reduction in price of an eighth of a cent a pound on the product of the beet-sugar factory.

It would, as we all know, diminish the cost of refined sugar to the American consumer, or at least prevent its being made exorbitantly high. Nobody contends that the reduction proposed in this bill on Cuban raw sugar will do any such thing. Surely, gentlemen, while we are so much concerned about the people of Cuba we might at least have some regard for our own people.

I have sat here now for going on six years and listened to lamentations from the other side, which would have put to shame the immortal Jeremiah, about the exactions to which the American people are subjected. I have heard from both sides Philipics against these unholy combinations called trusts. I think gentlemen will bear me out when I say that I have joined in none of these. I have known that great combinations were the result of a natural evolution in business, and that great business meant great capital and great combination. And some of these combinations have certainly not been an injury, but a benefit to our trade and our national greatness and power.

But here is a combination whose avowed purpose has been to throttle and crush. Here is one which has levied the most exorbitant exactions. Here is one which would stop healthy development. Here is one which has grown rich and strong under our protection. Here is one not satisfied with that protection, not willing to live and let live. Here it is unblushingly asking for more, and hypocritically calling for it in the name of humanity and philanthropy. Here it is right before us.

Here is your opportunity to strike it, not in anger or in a mere spirit of hostility and reprisal or in blind and indiscriminating rage, but in justice and equity. What are you going to do? It will not do to offer general and sweeping amendments which you know will have no chance to be adopted and ought not to be adopted. It will not do to talk about removal of duties from all trust-made goods or from all those sold abroad cheaper than they are sold at home. It will not do to attempt a general crusade upon all tariff schedules. That is not involved here and has no place here. Such amendments are only offered for political effect. They are not sincere. They are not meant to be adopted.

Do not scatter. Do not bring in such amendments, but strike for that which can be accomplished. Strike at that which is before you.

Mr. CANDLER. Will the gentleman stand and not scatter?

Mr. MORRIS. I will not vote for any such amendments. I do not believe in tampering with tariff schedules to-day. At this time of unexampled prosperity I would do nothing which might even tend to destroy confidence.

Mr. CANDLER. Will you stand against the differential?

Mr. MORRIS. Indeed I will; I will offer the amendment and don't you bother about that [applause], because they do not need protection. The best experts say that they are now able to compete with all the world if they would be satisfied with a fair return on what their plant is worth. I do not want them to be able to pay interest on ninety millions of capital when they should be satisfied with the interest on \$25,000,000 of capital.

Mr. VANDIVER. Does the gentleman think that the steel trust needs protection?

Mr. MORRIS. I do not know whether it does or not. The proposition here is a sugar proposition, pure and simple. Everybody here knows that, and you may be sure that the people of the United States understand it. You need not think they can be or will be deceived. Here is the sugar trust right before you. Here is your opportunity at least to do justice, to smite what ought to be smitten. Here is a plain and simple proposition that will accomplish that object and benefit our own people. What are you going to do about it? I propose to see, for I shall offer the necessary amendment at the proper time. [Applause.] And I shall call on all those who wish sincerely to accomplish something to show their sincerity now that they have the opportunity.

In conclusion, let me say that I have spoken, as I believe, in the interest of justice to our own people and liberality and good faith to Cuba. I am as willing as any man here to fulfill every obligation to Cuba, and I am willing, as every other American citizen ought to be, to bear my part of the burden. I am not willing by my vote to cast that burden on one interest. The great, generous-hearted American people can not afford to do that, and would not knowingly do it. I have spoken as a Republican, believing in the doctrines of that party, and determined to keep its pledges and preserve its honor. I have spoken as an American, standing for my own country, its labor and its industries, against all the world. [Loud applause.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, this, in my opinion, is one of the most vicious measures that have been considered by Congress since we embarked on the fateful policy of expansion, more than three years ago. Indeed, it is the natural outgrowth of that policy, but for which we would not to-day be confronted with this and other grave problems imperatively demanding solution at our hands.

The forcible annexation of Porto Rico and the compulsory sale of the Philippines to us were followed by enactments of the law-making power which occasioned fierce and bitter controversies among the people and litigation before the courts, resulting in a line of judicial decisions new to the legal profession and unsatisfactory to many laymen throughout the country.

But if those acts provoked controversy and wrought confusion they were as nothing when compared with the dissensions which this bill will breed and the mischief it will do. The avowed purpose of its advocates is to assist the Cubans and benefit the Americans at one and the same time, but I maintain that it will do neither.

In the first place, the Cubans are in need of no such help at our hands, nor are we under any such obligations to give aid if they did need it. Much testimony has been taken by the Ways and Means Committee on the subject since the beginning of this Congress. Men engaged in the sugar, tobacco, and cigar industries, both in Cuba and the United States, were here, and gave their opinions for and against the propositions involved. So that no phase of this question was left untouched or unconsidered, and it was clearly shown that the Cubans were and are in a fairly prosperous condition; much better off, indeed, than people in many sections of this country.

The sugar planters and manufacturers, as well as the tobacco growers, were shown to be making money on their investments; at the same time among the laboring classes all those who desire work can find employment at remunerative wages. From \$24 to \$30 per month are the prices now being paid laborers in the cane fields and the sugar factories on the island of Cuba, while liberal wages are paid to those in other branches of employment. Laborers are scarce, according to the testimony, and the labor problem is one of the greatest, as it is one of the first, with which the Cuban people will have to deal.

So great is the demand for labor and so difficult to procure it there, that the question of the importation of cheaper foreign labor is now being considered by the Cubans, and the fear here is that Chinese labor will be imported into that island to such an



extent as to menace the industrial and labor conditions in our own country.

This fear is recognized by the framers of this bill, for one of its provisions has for its object the exclusion of foreign labor and Chinese immigration, just as the same are excluded from this country, and that, too, in face of the fact that Cuba is just starting where we started more than a century ago, and needs labor to till her soil, to work her factories, and to develop her wonderful resources. I am not criticising the measure, however, on that ground.

I am only calling attention to the fact, as I pass on, for the purpose of showing some of the inconsistencies in the position assumed by the advocates of the bill.

Cuba, since the Spanish war, has marketed at fair prices all her chief productions—sugar, tobacco, and cigars—and is doing so now, with the exception of sugar, the price of which has recently fallen so low that the larger planters are holding for better prices. Overproduction—common, however, in other branches of business—is the cause here. But this will soon be remedied by the law of supply and demand, and the price of sugar will again rise to a paying margin.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if all this is true, if labor is fully employed on the island and at remunerative wages, if the products of this labor are all practically being sold at fair prices, then I submit to the House that there is no need of this gift of more than \$6,000,000 in the shape of lost revenue to our Government, and the many millions more to the sugar, tobacco, and other industries of the country affected by the measure.

Mr. Chairman, what is the complaint? Why, that all the people in the island are not making money; that they have lost heavily by the ravages of war; that all the tobacco of last year's crop has not been sold, and that the price of sugar has recently fallen below the point where it can be profitably marketed.

But suppose all these things are true. Do they furnish a reason for donations on our part such as this bill seeks to give? There has scarcely been an industry in this country, whether of the farm, the factory, or the mine, the prices of whose products have not for one cause or another been at times depressed, and yet not all of these have come here for help. A few years ago the price of cotton dropped even below the cost of production in many places in the South, but no one thought of asking Congress for aid. Overproduction was the chief cause, but it did not last long. The supply soon adjusted itself to the demand, and prices went up again.

Then, too, disasters from fire and frosts, floods and storms have fallen upon the different sections of the country at one time or another, but seldom have the sufferers asked help of the General Government. A few years ago a disaster as blighting as the ravages of war have been to Cuba befell the people of my State. In a single night more than \$25,000,000 of property was destroyed by the frosts of winter, but no aid was asked by the unfortunate sufferers and none was given by the National Government. To themselves alone our people looked for relief; upon their own energies they relied for aid, and from this source alone it came, and to-day Florida is richer than ever before in material wealth and in the self-reliance of her people. So it will be with the Cubans if left to themselves.

But assuming, for the sake of argument, that the Cubans need relief, will this measure secure it to them? I maintain not. The principal benefits, according to the advocates of the bill, are largely to come through the sugar industry. Now, nearly, if not the entire output of that industry in Cuba, is controlled by the sugar trust, which can to a large extent control the prices which the producers will obtain. The production of sugar in that island this year will, it is said, reach about 1,000,000 tons, the surplus of which will be purchased mainly by this trust, and while up to the present time Germany, by reason of being the largest sugar-producing country in the world, has fixed and controlled to a considerable extent the price of that article, the moment this bill becomes a law and the treaty for which it provides has been negotiated conditions will begin to change and the surplus of Cuban sugar will largely regulate prices everywhere.

True, German sugar will continue to exert an influence over prices, but the duty here on European sugar will militate against that article, giving the Cuban sugar a clear field in our markets. The output may and doubtless will increase from year to year, but will never get from under the control of the sugar trust, which will continue to regulate the price there. We know something of the power of these trusts. They are organized for the purpose of securing the greatest profit at the minimum of cost. To that end, of course, all their energies and means are directed, and by the simple means of refraining from purchasing for a time the trust can depress prices, or by buying can raise them. But in any event the sugar trust will become the beneficiary of our generous policy, and not the Cuban people.

Nor is the cigar industry in any better shape. Two large syndi-

cates, one of them English, control 90 per cent of all the cigar manufacturing business in Cuba. This English syndicate, a foreign institution, controls 60 per cent of the entire Cuban output.

And these are the people, Mr. Chairman, for whom we are to legislate, in so far as the main productions of the island are concerned. To trusts and syndicates who are abundantly able to take care of themselves, we reduce our revenues upward of six millions of dollars and impoverish our own people many tens of millions more without lowering the price to the consumers of imported goods a particle.

But, sir, we are told that the Cuban people are demanding these concessions. That I deny. The masses of the Cubans—those who maintained the struggle against Spain from 1895 to 1898, who faced fire and sword that they might be free, and for whom we declared and waged war against their oppressors—care nothing about reciprocity. Indeed, they are scarcely willing to accept anything at the hands of this Government. They did not want us to go to war for them, because they feared the consequences of American domination. They have chafed under our occupation of the island. They believe we have given them a stone instead of bread, only an exchange of masters instead of liberty, and their feeling against us has to some extent become embittered by these considerations.

As tending to prove what I say, I will read an extract from a letter which I received a few months ago from a person residing in Cuba, who speaks and understands thoroughly the Spanish language, is well acquainted with the Cuban people, and in a position to know what he is talking about, together with a clipping from *La Lucha* of December 9 last, a newspaper published in Habana, and one which for a long time maintained a kindly feeling for this Government.

After the address and some other matters not necessary to read, the writer proceeds as follows:

I inclose an editorial translated from *La Lucha* of the 9th instant. The cavalry forces referred to therein are rural guard. This paper last week advised Maso's supporters to string up a few people to lamp-posts if they were not given representation on the electoral board.

This article is a fair sample of the sentiment that is often expressed in the newspapers with respect to our Government. *La Lucha* is the only paper that has ever expressed any gratitude for what the United States has done for this island, except the papers supporting Palma, which, during the last few days, have had words of kindness for us, and it is easily seen that they are prompted by the efforts of the Administration to secure tariff concessions for the island.

Now follows the clipping from the newspaper, which I ask the indulgence of the committee to read:

[Clipped from *La Lucha* of December 9.]

#### QUESTIONS OF THE DAY.

*La Nación* publishes the following under the title, "Revolutionary Judases:"

"The illicit combination between the intervening authorities, the intervened authorities, and the bureaucrats depending on the one and on the other is now beginning to bear its evil fruit among the Cuban people. Indeed, nothing else could have happened, as the insolence of these people united together to bring about the triumph of the candidature of Señor Estrada Palma borders on the most insulting provocation which any country was ever called upon to suffer.

"It seems as if the idea were to cause a protest, born of dignity, to burst forth with implacable ferocity, or that those who have the right on their side and are now the victims of the insults and frauds and other forms of the electoral pillage should bend the knee, like vile cowards, to the will of the Yankee governors and their Cuban lackeys."

The puppets of the American policy are dreaming when they think such things. Sooner will we all play the last card, whatever may be the result which our action may cause to this unhappy land, lowered by the depravity of some of its miserable sons; sooner will we undertake a civil war with all its tremendous consequences; sooner will we renounce the ridiculous republic which is offered to us; sooner will we appeal to the means which despair has to offer than tolerate being delivered, tied hand and foot, at the feet of the foreign despot by a handful of traitors who should have been hanged long ago.

It is time that the comedy ceased. It is necessary to tear the mask from the face of the general of the revolution, who has sold himself to the intervenores. It is necessary that we stand up and resist the storm in which an attempt is being made to involve us. In short, it is necessary that we rebel against the scoundrels who have made their country a storehouse for plunder and its flag an infected rag. Happen what may, anything is preferable to resignedly consenting to the crime which is being carried out in the palace of the Plaza de Armas and in the palaces of the civil governors and in which the Judases are bucking on their swords to plunge the country in an abyss without the least pang of remorse.

And if what is sought is that the battle should commence, we who have not provoked it accept the challenge extended to us, and there will be plenty of time to commence the fight.

The die is cast. Either with the traitors who are supporting Estrada Palma by means of the power they enjoy, or with the loyalists who are around Señor Maso. Enough has been had of miserable farces.

We have had an atmosphere of hate thrust upon us. And we are ready. The intervention was able to hold us back to avoid compromising the destinies of the laughable republic about to be set up, but neither the intervention nor anything else can prevent us from saving the little honor left us.

The shame of Cuba is a small matter to those who live by Cuba, as they put her to public auction; but it matters a great deal to those who will die for Cuba if there is no other way open.

What scene will be beheld shortly in our country? A thousand times cursed are those who contemplate them protected by the arm of the Yankee.

Blessed those who resist them.



I have read these extracts, Mr. Chairman, for no other purpose than to show that the Cuban people are not likely to be asking gifts at our hands. No doubt the sugar and cigar factories there, as well as a few other interests, would like to see this bill passed. But as before stated, the masses of the people in my judgment are not demanding reciprocity between this country and Cuba, and certainly not the brand that is provided for in this measure.

I have said and I repeat that this measure will not benefit the American people nor profit those in Cuba to any great extent; nor is it a desirable piece of legislation looked at from any standpoint from which you may choose to view it. If we look at it from the point of view of the tobacco grower, the cigar manufacturer, the sugar producer, or the grower of citrus and other semitropical fruits, we will see injury to some and ultimate destruction to others of these great industries.

If we examine it from the standpoint of commerce—of business to be done with the Cubans—there is little to commend it to our favorable consideration. While if we observe it from the standpoint of tariff reform, it is a delusion and a snare. It violates Democratic principles; nor is it wholly in accord with Republican doctrines as I have read and heard them expounded. It is unsound in theory, unwise in policy, and will be found pernicious in practice.

Of course I do not suppose that a 20 per cent reduction will destroy all the industries I have just mentioned, but it will injure them all, and if carried further, as is intended by many, will eventually wipe the sugar, cigar, and tobacco industries of this country out of existence. At least that is the opinion and the testimony of those best competent to judge.

But it is said by the advocates of the bill, when they lose sight for the moment, as they do occasionally, of the sentimental side of this matter of Cuban reciprocity, that it will increase our trade with Cuba. But admitting this to be true, the increase will be insignificant as compared with the mischief that will be done to the industries which come within the range of its influence, to say nothing of the loss of six or seven millions of revenue.

The majority report, as well as the so-called minority report made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. McCLELLAN], takes rather a roseate view of the advantages that will accrue to us by the passage of this bill. But many do not share these views with him. I, for one, do not, as it is my opinion that no such results as he predicts will follow, and I shall not be surprised when the first of December of next year rolls around to find that no good has come to trade between this country and Cuba from the measure now under consideration.

Of the \$66,572,802 in value which Cuba imported during the year 1901, the United States furnished her with only \$28,017,820 worth, and it is though, by passing the bill we are now considering that this amount can be increased very largely.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this expectation is based upon the idea that by reducing the Cuban tariff upon certain articles which may go from this country into that these importations will be increased. But the duty on imports into Cuba from our country has not been sufficiently high to prevent these \$28,000,000 worth of our products going into Cuba, embracing nearly every article transported by us to the most favored countries of the world, thus showing that the present tariff stands but little in the way of our trade with the Cuban people.

The truth of the matter is that the inhabitants of tropical countries are not heavy importers of the products of more northerly climes; hence we can not expect to ever do any great amount of business with our colonial possessions situated in the Tropics, or with Cuba, even under the most favorable trade regulations.

I know that some of the advocates of this measure point with sorrow to the supposed decadence of our trade with Cuba, while others more optimistic look with exultant pride at the large shipment of our productions into that island during the past three years, and prophesy great things for the future. But, Mr. Chairman, these importations were not the result of normal conditions, but rather the consequence of necessities created by the ravages of war and the sudden increase of business stimulated by the presence of a large number of our soldiers there, and it is but natural that when the necessities created by these abnormal conditions have been met and the conditions themselves have changed, that our trade with Cuba should fall off and assume its normal state whether the tariff be high or low.

But suppose, sir, that our exports to that island should be doubled, the aggregate then would hardly be a drop in the bucket as compared with the vast amount of our exports to the larger countries of the world. Last year we exported \$1,487,764,991 worth of the products of this country—nearly thirty times more than would be our commerce with Cuba if the wildest dreams of the most radical of the reciprocity advocates are realized, a commerce hardly sufficient to justify us in inflicting the loss upon the sugar and tobacco growers which this bill would entail upon them.

Mr. Chairman, why not try reciprocity with some of the Euro-

pean countries—with France and Germany, for instance? Our exports to Europe for 1901 amounted to \$1,136,504,605, of which \$191,780,427 went to Germany and \$78,714,935 to France. These countries present an opportunity for the exploitation of the reciprocity idea not to be found in Cuba or, as to that matter, in any of the tropical countries.

The combined population of these two countries—France and Germany—is about 90,000,000, as against 1,500,000 in Cuba. The soil is not as productive as that of Cuba and their people consume more per capita of the products we have to sell than the native Cuban population. The soil of Cuba is perhaps the most fertile in the world. Everything produced in tropical countries can be grown there in great abundance, and, as a rule, at a minimum of cost. Whatever is necessary to sustain life can be grown except breadstuffs, and this the Cubans will buy of us whether they have reciprocity with the United States or not.

But, Mr. Chairman, this bill not only provides for a 20 per cent reduction on imports from Cuba into this country, but also a similar reduction upon goods carried by this country into that. Now, the Cuban government when established will depend for its support largely upon import duties; and if we should furnish all the imports, as the majority report suggests we will do, where will the Cubans get sufficient revenue to support their government? They will necessarily be compelled to levy either a direct tax upon property or excise duties of some kind, something no country as weak as Cuba can stand. So it would appear, Mr. Chairman, that while we would give to them with one hand we rob them with the other.

Then, sir, why should there be any need for reciprocal trade arrangements between this country and the island of Cuba? Europe, with her hundreds and millions of population which must be fed and clothed presents, in my opinion, a much more inviting field for reciprocity. Let us try it there, where something may be done for and not against the farmer.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I regret to see some of my friends on this side of the House take the position they are assuming on this question. I, of course, know that their motives are of the best, but I think their judgment is at fault. The gentleman from New York [Mr. McCLELLAN], in his report, which he styles "the views of the minority" (and in this, I think, he is right, because very few, I imagine, share all his views), says, in substance, that the provisions of the bill are in direct line with Democratic doctrine, and seems to think it his duty to strike at the tariff tax wherever and whenever opportunity offers.

This idea, carried to its ultimate result, would overthrow the doctrine of tariff taxation even for revenue. Since when has this proposition been a tenet of Democratic faith? Certainly, no such doctrine has ever found a place in a Democratic national platform. In fact, it has ever been one of the cardinal principles of that party that the raising of revenue should be the prime object of tariff taxation, and that this tax should be so levied as to fall, if possible, more heavily upon the luxuries than upon the necessities of life.

Then, too, the Democratic party has claimed to guard and has sought to guard the interests of the agricultural classes wherever it has been possible to do so. Yet the chief burdens created by this bill fall most heavily upon the agricultural classes. True, the cigar industry bears a part of the burden, and tobacco, sugar, and semitropical fruits are also hurt. All these products, except raw sugar, are luxuries and can well afford the high rate of taxation.

While sugar being a product of the farm should, to say the least, not be discriminated against in favor of the refined sugar—a product of the trust which still retains a part of its differential in spite of efforts to remove this discriminating tax. And now the spectacle is presented of an effort to reduce the taxes on farm products and luxuries, while those of the steel, sugar, and other trusts are left untouched. Certainly this can not be in accord with the principles or teachings of that party which has always boasted, and justly so, too, of its friendliness to labor in all its branches.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are approaching in this bill the great question of reciprocity from the wrong standpoint. Before we can deal with it properly and so as to do the greatest good to the greatest number, with as little harm as possible, we should have a general revision of the tariff, so that all rates and schedules may be readjusted and reciprocal trade relations arranged with reference to these readjusted schedules. Then, the prime object of raising revenue being attained, the burden of taxes may be regulated so that no discrimination against American farmers and American labor will be created, and so that luxuries and not the necessities shall bear the greatest burden in the support of the Government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, no one would go further than I to help the Cubans if they needed help and desired it at our hands. We have made sacrifices for them in the past, and I would be willing



to do it in the future; but what they desire and need most is to be left alone to govern themselves as they may think best. The strong arm of our Government will ever be over them to protect, if need be, but never, I hope, to govern or oppress. They are, in my judgment, capable of self-government. Let them try the experiment.

We helped them to drive the Spaniard away at the cost of many hundreds of millions of treasure and thousands of precious lives. We have assisted them for the past several years in maintaining order on the island. We have given them a lesson in sanitation which, if utilized, will root out and finally destroy the yellow-fever scourge there. Then, if our occupation of that island has been helpful and we have placed them in a condition to set up a stable form of government, which may in time even be satisfactory to them, and if from now on we carry out our promises to Cuba and her people, we will have done well by them indeed.

But, after all, is it not about time that we were beginning to look after the interests and the necessities of our own people at home and less after those beyond the seas? Let us, then, begin to look more to our own homes, to our own people and their interests, than to those of foreign lands and distant climes. Our continental domain is vast, our people progressive, enterprising, and homogeneous; our resources boundless and varied, the development of which has scarcely yet begun; our Government the best the world has ever seen; our destiny the grandest and our future the brightest of all the nations of the earth if we but curb our greed for territorial aggrandizement. So, let us then, as representatives of the people, withdraw our gaze from across the seas and direct our attention and energies to the upbuilding of our own country, to the end that her people may be prosperous and their condition improved. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the measure under consideration proposes a reciprocal agreement with Cuba to continue in force until the 1st day of December, 1903, whereby the products of Cuba, principally sugar and tobacco, are to enter our markets upon the payment of 20 per cent less than the duties imposed on like articles from other countries, and our products and manufactures are to enter Cuba with at least a like reduction of duty.

The consideration of this measure involves a recognition of the relations we sustain toward Cuba; as were the question presented simply one of a reciprocal agreement with a foreign country for the purpose of securing trade advantages, the situation would be greatly simplified. We shall stand before the world when the Cuban Government shall have been fully organized as her sponsor and protector, and the Cuban people are justified in maintaining that the Platt amendment, qualifying, as it does, their complete independence, places us under at least a moral obligation to give their interests some consideration.

I do not think there can be any question in the mind of any honest investigator relative to the critical industrial condition impending in Cuba as a result of the present low price of sugar—her principal product. It seems to me that the testimony is conclusive that sugar can not be produced there on the average for less than 2 cents per pound, and one does not need to be much of a mathematician to appreciate the fact that with sugar selling at from two to three tenths of a cent per pound less than that sum, the planter and sugar raiser is suffering a very considerable loss, and that therefore whatever present conditions are it will be but a short time until the planters and producers of sugar are in sore financial straits, and the labor of the islands either out of employment or forced to accept a considerably reduced wage.

Some gentlemen dismiss the consideration of this phase of the situation with the flippant suggestion that we are not responsible for the present depression of the sugar market, nor for the results which may follow in Cuba as the effect of that depression. But I submit that, having assumed the rôle of the liberator, guardian, and godfather to Cuba, we can not within a day or a week or a month after her government is established throw off all responsibility with regard to her, either in fairness to Cuba or in justice to ourselves, particularly in view of the fact that in turning her loose to walk alone among the nations of the earth we are keeping a very substantial leading string upon her in the Platt amendment. But our obligations to Cuba by reason of the peculiar relation we sustain to her is but one and in my mind not the controlling factor in this situation. Free Cuba, to be successful, must be prosperous. Depressed industrial conditions, low wages, lack of employment, means trouble for the new government, possibly serious trouble. Serious trouble means intervention, and intervention, in my opinion, would necessitate annexation.

I have attempted to approach this subject from the broad standpoint of sound public policy as I understand it. Whatever bias I have in the matter comes from a lively interest in the growing beet-sugar industry of the nation—an industry which has made wonderful progress in the last few years, and which, in my opinion, is destined to have a still more remarkable development in

the years to come. As a friend of the beet-sugar industry, as a wellwisher of the cane-sugar industry of the country, as one desirous of putting off as long as possible the inevitable day of Cuban annexation, with its fatal competition under free-trade relations with a number of American industries, I feel it my duty to support any reasonable measure calculated, as I believe the measure now before us is, to aid in maintaining at least a reasonable degree of prosperity in Cuba, in order that the new government may be inaugurated and established without the immediate embarrassment of depressed industrial conditions, which would inevitably create discontent, disorder, and either a demand for annexation on the part of the Cuban people or the necessity of it as the result of an enforced intervention by us.

The necessity or the advisability of some action on our part to relieve the threatened industrial crisis in Cuba, owing to the low price of sugar, being admitted, the question arises, can we provide an adequate remedy without injury to any American industry or hardship to any class of American citizens? If we can not, then whatever our obligation to Cuba may be, our first duty is to our own citizens and their interests are entitled to our first consideration. But, Mr. Chairman, it is fortunate both for the United States and her people, and for Cuba as well, that the proposed legislation, while affording reasonable relief, can by no possibility disastrously affect the industries or the welfare of our own citizens.

Even were the proposed reduction of 20 per cent in favor of Cuba on our sugar tariff to affect the market price of sugar to the American consumer by that amount, and thus to that extent reduce the protection now offered to the beet-sugar producers, I believe the legislation would be justifiable in view of the benefits we would derive from it, and the fact that in my opinion the beet-sugar producer would still have adequate protection. But no one believes that the agreement proposed will in any wise affect the protection afforded the beet-sugar producer by our sugar tariff, for the price of sugar to the consumer will be fixed then as now by the cost of that portion of our imports of sugar which is bought in the open markets of the world and which pays our full tariff duties.

It seems to me that the argument which has been advanced that the reduction of duty on Cuban sugar will not go to the Cuban planter is scarcely worthy of serious consideration. Surely the Cuban planter will not be simple enough to accept a lower price for his product than is paid at the same time and place for a similar article. It is the first time that I ever heard of the possibility of there being two prices for the same article at the same time and in the same market.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MORRIS] in his remarks a few moments ago quoted from quite a startling array of figures in the attempt to prove that the planters of Hawaii have not been receiving a price for their sugar to which they are entitled by reason of free entry into our markets. I do not pretend to question the accuracy of the gentleman's figures, but I spent a month in Hawaii three years ago, during which time I made some study of the sugar industry there, largely because, being interested in the growth of the beet-sugar industry in this country, I was anxious to learn whether that industry could survive in free competition with cane sugar grown under as favorable conditions as existed in Hawaii.

Among other inquiries I made of the Hawaiian planters was in regard to the price they received for their product. I had heard a good deal of the all-powerful sugar trust, and was anxious to know whether that organization had been able to rob the American planter of any of the benefits derived from free access to our markets.

The planters with whom I talked informed me that they had an agreement whereby they sold their sugar to the agents of the American refineries at a price equivalent to the New York price of sugar on the day their sugar landed in San Francisco, less the difference in freight rates. I ask the attention of my friend from Minnesota [Mr. MORRIS] to this as the testimony of Hawaiian planters themselves three years ago. The gentleman has contended that the Hawaiian planter is not getting the full benefit of the relief from the payment of the American duty, whereas Hawaiian planters said to me—and a number of them made the same statement—that they had an agreement whereby they were paid for their sugar, on the day it landed in San Francisco, the price of the same quality of sugar, duty paid, on the same day in the markets of New York, less an agreed adjustment of freights. So they received absolutely all that their sugar was worth and all of the benefit of the remission of tariff duty.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is another side to this question. This is by no means a one-sided arrangement which we are entering into, but a reciprocal agreement under which, in my opinion, we will eventually be large gainers in the matter of trade. Cuba, even in her present undeveloped condition, just emerging from a long continued and devastating war, with but a small proportion



of her land under cultivation, has a trade of \$38,000,000 per annum which now goes to other countries than ours. We can not hope or expect to get all of this trade under the reciprocity agreement proposed, but I believe we are assured of securing a large portion of it, and as Cuba increases in population, and the purchasing power of her citizens increases, as it will rapidly, there can be no doubt but what our trade with her will very largely increase in consequence of the trade advantages we are to gain under the provisions of this measure.

It is inevitable, in my opinion, that Cuba should some time become a part of the United States. As I have stated before, my hope is that this union will be long delayed. I believe it is best for the people of the United States and for the people of Cuba that it should be. We are neither prepared for free competition with her sugar, tobacco, and other products, nor would it be well to invite at this time the settlement of the numerous political and social questions the annexation of Cuba would bring.

My eloquent friend who addressed the committee a short time ago, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH], said that from the standpoint of the beet-sugar producer he had no fear of the effect of Cuban annexation. Whatever the probabilities of that event may be, there is no doubt whatever in my mind that the annexation of Cuba, with Cuban sugar free, means the death of the beet-sugar industry of the United States.

It has been said that the cost of the production of sugar in Cuba is 2 cents a pound. I believe that is about the cost in all tropical countries. It has been contended by the gentlemen who say they represent the beet-sugar people on this floor that sugar can be produced in Cuba for less than 2 cents a pound. That may be possible. The testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means was that it cost 4 cents a pound to produce beet sugar. One gentleman alone of all those before the committee, I believe, said that beet sugar might ultimately be produced in the United States for  $3\frac{1}{4}$  cents a pound.

Let us say that in the future, by improved processes—by the reduction of the wages of American labor, if you will, which heaven forbid—the cost of beet sugar in the United States may be brought to 3 cents a pound, or  $\frac{1}{4}$  cent lower than the lowest estimate. Then, supposing the cost of the production of cane sugar shall not go below 2 cents a pound, there is still an advantage to the cane-sugar producers of Cuba of a cent a pound. This would be \$20 a ton, and allowing four tons to the acre, it would be an advantage of \$80 an acre. As the average production in Cuba is considerably above that the advantage is greater. In Hawaii they produce as high as 12 tons of sugar on one acre of land; and if they had the advantage of only 1 cent a pound over the beet-sugar producer, it would be 12 times \$20 an acre or \$240 an acre of clear profit to the Hawaiian sugar planter, above the cost of producing sugar from beets in the United States.

Is there any possibility or probability that an acre will ever be sown to sugar beets anywhere in America after the day when Cuba shall become a part of this Union? In my opinion such a union means inevitably the destruction of the beet-sugar industry in this country and of the cane-sugar industry as well, unless in that day we provide for those industries by high bounty.

Remember that Cuba has never produced sugar under the most improved methods; that Hawaii produces more sugar to the acre and produces it more cheaply, except where she irrigates, than Cuba has ever done; that when they shall give up the slovenly methods of perennial crops in Cuba, which is not a cheap method of raising sugar, but an expensive one; when they shall come to the Hawaiian system of planting every other crop they will produce sugar even more cheaply than they do now, and when that time comes does anyone imagine that the beet-sugar industry of America shall survive unless protected by a bounty?

So, as a friend of the beet-sugar industry, I am anxious to put off as long as possible the day when Cuba shall ask to become part of the Union, or when we shall be compelled to take her in order to prevent continual uprisings there.

I believe the surest way to postpone annexation is to insure Cuba industrial tranquillity, which, I believe, this measure will tend to do. It is best both for us and for the Cubans, in my opinion, that for a time they address themselves as an independent people to the task of working out the problems of self-government.

Inasmuch, however, as Cuban annexation is one of the certainties of the future, it is of vast importance to us that when Cuba shall come into the Union she shall present no more serious social and racial problems than those presented by her present population; that there shall not be added to these difficulties and complications of dealing with a large population of cooly laborers, and therefore that feature of this legislation which provides for her adoption of our Chinese exclusion and immigration laws is of vast importance—of such importance that, in my opinion, we would be largely justified in this legislation by the promise it holds out of excluding from Cuba undesirable classes of immigrants, if there were no other considerations involved.

The measure before us is in complete harmony with the Republican policy of reciprocity in that it promises us large returns in increased trade without menace or danger to any American industry. It keeps faith with the Cubans, who have reason to expect from us advantageous trade relations in exchange for like benefits in our trade with them. In brief, it might properly be called a bill for the purpose of keeping faith with Cuba; of insuring industrial prosperity and political tranquillity there, with a view of postponing annexation and free trade with her in sugar and tobacco; of adding largely to the trade and commerce of the United States, and for the exclusion from a contiguous territory, which some day will become a part of the United States, of persons who would be harmful and unfair competitors with our people while Cuba remains an independent republic and undesirable citizens when she becomes a part of the American Union.

I believe the legislation is wise, that it will be beneficial to Cuba and her people, and to the Government and people of the United States as well. No class of men should more heartily support it than those especially interested in the beet and cane sugar industries of the United States, for it disposes, in my opinion, for a long time to come, of the most serious menace with which they have or will be threatened—that of Cuban annexation. Above all else, it is in keeping with the high aims and purposes of the American people in all their dealings with Cuba, and completes and rounds out undertakings and legislation in her behalf which will ever reflect credit and glory on the Republic and, in the fullness of time, work to our material advantage as well. [Applause.]

Mr. BALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, addressing myself to the pending measure, I desire to call the attention of the House to one peculiar fact connected with this bill, and that is that the Ways and Means Committee have reported a bill for our consideration that meets with the unqualified approval of no person in all these United States; a bill that is not the embodiment of the wishes and desires or convictions of any member of the Ways and Means Committee, which is not the embodiment of the views of any Democrat upon this side of the Chamber, of any Republican on the other side, and is not in response to the demands of those who speak for Cuba and ask at the hands of Congress relief for the Cuban people. So that in voting upon this measure upon its final passage, if it be unamended, as I prophesy that it will be, every man will be called upon either to swallow a bill which is not in accordance with his judgment or to reject it because in his judgment it is unwise and indefensible.

Now, it is not for me to say to the Democratic members of this House that no Democrat can vote for this measure. It would ill become any proponent of this bill to say that all Democrats must vote for this bill if they are Democrats. I trust the time will never come in this country when Democrats are bound as Democrats to support a bill as a Democratic proposition which after weeks of deliberation, dissension, and divisions among the Republican members of this House is reported as a Republican measure. To do so, many Republicans had to surrender their judgment, compromise their differences, and yield to party discipline that the bill might be reported to the House without the aid of Democratic votes.

Therefore if it is charged, as it has been unjustly charged, that those of us upon this side of the Chamber who oppose the bill are following the lead of members who are interested in beet sugar or in cane sugar and that we desire protection for those industries, I will not retort by saying that you are trying to protect the protected monopolies of this country, which by this bill obtain 20 per cent protection in Cuba in addition to the protection which they enjoy at home. If I had to make choice, however, between the Democracy of Louisiana and the Republicanism of Pennsylvania, arrayed upon opposite sides on this bill, I would have no cause to hesitate. The Louisiana Democrats simply insist that Cuban competition will destroy the value of Louisiana sugar plantations; that this bill will not benefit Cuban producers or American consumers, but will enrich the "sugar trust."

I am willing, for my part, to cast my vote with the Democrats of Louisiana and members representing the agricultural interests of this country [applause] in the West engaged in raising beets and attempting to compete with the "sugar trust" in refining sugar, and say to my brother Democrats, without reflecting upon them, if you prefer the Democracy of Mr. PAYNE of New York, and of Mr. DALZELL of Pennsylvania, "the high priest of protection" [laughter], and to follow the Republican majority reporting this bill, you are at liberty to make your choice and I will make mine.

Now, let me ask, why is this bill here? In my judgment it is here because the American Sugar Refining Company, commonly called the "sugar trust," has found west of the Mississippi River a competitor in the beet-sugar producers, who are also the beet-sugar refiners.

In the testimony given before the Ways and Means Committee it was shown that Willet and Grey in October, 1901, before the present agitation had begun, said that the cause of the trouble



between the American Sugar Refining Company and the beet refineries was that the American beet-sugar men would not confine themselves alone to the business of raising raw sugar, but insisted upon getting into the business of refining sugar. Willet and Grey are recognized as the sugar trust's organ. Now, in pursuit of the plan to control the sugar markets of the United States the sugar trust went out West and into the Missouri Valley and made a reduction of 2 cents a pound on refined sugar after the beet-sugar men had made contracts for future delivery based upon the market price.

The beet sugar refineries instead of meeting that price and sacrificing their property simply offered to fill their orders with American Sugar Refining sugar at the market price, and the American Sugar Refining Company had to raise the price and leave that field unoccupied, as it could not afford to stand the loss which it had planned to inflict upon the beet-sugar refineries and thus force its only competitor to the wall.

Now, the next thing, Mr. Havemeyer, the head of the great "sugar trust," gave out an interview in which he declared—and I have that also from the testimony before the Ways and Means Committee—"that Congress ought to put raw sugar upon the free list." Notice, he wants raw sugar, not refined, to come in free. Why? Because if the "sugar trust," which is practically the sole buyer of raw sugar in this country and refiner of cane sugar, can get raw sugar upon the free list from Cuba, or raw sugar at a reduced price from Cuba and leave the duty or differential upon refined sugar, it will not be compelled to reduce its exactions upon the American consumer, but it can take the action of Congress as a club to compel the Louisiana cane-sugar producers and the beet-sugar producers of this country to sell their products at a reduced price and force the beet-sugar men to stop refining sugar.

Then the "sugar trust" would be in undisputed control of this market and the Cuban market. Thus began a campaign to manufacture a belief that Cuba urgently needed relief. By enlisting all the newspapers they could, sending out circulars through their agents, Willet and Grey, and other devices, they sought to impose upon the people of this country the idea that there was great distress in Cuba that must be relieved, trusting to our generosity and humanity to go to the rescue at any cost.

Next, the Secretary of War, who is not only a great soldier, ranking the Lieutenant-General of the Army, but is also a great lawyer, submits a very scholarly report to Congress in which he tells us our duty and describes conditions in Cuba. And yet, when the Ways and Means Committee meet to discuss what shall be done, it develops that that gentleman and soldier knows nothing about it himself except such reports as have been given to him ex parte from other sources.

And then comes another gentleman, who is a most admirable soldier and, I understand, a splendid doctor, General Wood, who sends out a circular letter for our consideration about economic conditions in Cuba, attempting to show that it costs at least 2 cents per pound to make raw sugar in Cuba and that at present prices bankruptcy must come. Yet, when confronted by some of General Wood's statements, one of the main witnesses before the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. Atkins, of Boston, merchant, sugar planter, trust refining magnate, and the owner of large plantations in Cuba, said:

While General Wood is a most estimable gentleman, and I would take his opinion on all military matters without question and as pertaining to the government of Cuba, I should prefer my own opinion in regard to the production of cane.

Thus General Wood was repudiated as an expert in such matters by the very gentlemen who appeared here in the interest of this measure. It was shown also that General Wood had made a mistake of nearly \$1 per sack in the price of raw sugar, estimating it that much too low. General Wood did not appear himself, but sent Colonel Bliss, collector of the port of Havana, as his representative before the committee. Colonel Bliss, when asked about the cost of production of sugar, said in substance:

I expected you gentlemen had found that out for yourselves. I am not an expert on that business.

Thus, when you come to the agencies that have created this sentiment, it resolves itself down to the American "sugar trust," to misinformed newspapers, to the Secretary of War, who had no information on the subject except that communicated to him by General Wood; to General Wood, who had no information on the subject as an expert; to the President, who relied upon General Wood, and American speculators owning plantations in Cuba and also closely allied with the "sugar trust."

Now, that was still insufficient to secure favorable action, and the "sugar trust" joined forces with the manufacturing and industrial trusts of this country, with the understanding that Cuba should have forced upon her a preferential duty of 20 per cent in favor of American industries seeking a market there. Then the industrial trusts of this country got behind the move-

ment, and with this combination of philanthropists, with this great aggregation of unselfish talent behind it, we have the remarkable spectacle of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee presenting this bill, which he himself originally opposed, and—a sight to make angels weep—almost shedding tears over the distresses of the poor Cuban.

Now, Mr. Chairman and fellow-members, you may convince me some day that the moon is made of green cheese, that a black crow can become white, but you will never convince me that a Republican majority in Congress or elsewhere will advocate a bill purely and alone upon the ground of sympathy for some country in which they have no interest other than that of humanity.

If we are going to pass this bill from the standpoint of distress in Cuba, before we give up \$8,000,000 of our revenue without any reduction to the American consumer, there ought to be a sufficient showing, first, that distress exists there and, second, that the measure will relieve it.

Now, as to the question of the distress in Cuba. I admit that they have a condition down there such as confronted the people of the South after the civil war. They have their plantations mortgaged for perhaps twice—that is the testimony—of their value. These plantations are owned not by Cubans but by Spaniards and by American speculators who have gone there since the war with Spain to exploit that country.

I know that there is one gentleman, a Republican, a personal friend of mine, Mr. Hawley, then a member of Congress, who told me when this era of expansion set in that the acquisition of the Philippine Islands and the annexation of Cuba would destroy the value of every plantation in the State of Louisiana, where he then had farms, and destroy the value of every plantation engaged in the business of raising beets. Then he was radically against such a policy. Now, since the war with Spain he has gone down to Cuba and, with Mr. Havemeyer and other American sugar-refining magnates, he is at the head of a syndicate that has a 75,000-acre farm or plantation or hacienda, or whatever you call it, and has either sold out in Louisiana or else his plantations are thrown upon the market.

Now we want to relieve him, and we want to relieve those gentlemen who own plantations; and yet Mr. Hawley stated in his testimony, and he ought to know, that Louisiana sugar can not be produced for less than 3½ cents, and that any price less than that would make the Louisiana plantations of no value, and he was a witness advocating reciprocity.

Now, this reduction of 20 per cent on raw sugar will make the tariff 1.34 cents a pound. If, as the experts from the Agricultural Department say, sugar can be produced in Cuba from 1.25 cents to 1.75 cents or 1.50 cents per pound on an average, or as the Austrian or French experts say, for 1½ cents to 1¼ cents, then, according to Mr. Hawley's own statement, this bill will let in raw sugar at a price that will give relief to Spanish owners of sugar plantations, that will give relief to Mr. Havemeyer and associates, but it will be a tariff that will make every plantation in Louisiana an undesirable investment.

Now, my friends, I am ready to put the Democracy of Louisiana to any Democratic test; I am ready to put the beet-sugar raisers of this country to any Democratic test. When you are ready to take off from the "Dingley tariff" some part or all of its exactions upon the American consumer, I will go to the Democrats in Louisiana, I will go to the Democrats from the West, and say, "You must stand your pro rata of the reduction upon tariff duties until it is reduced to a revenue basis; and if you do not submit to it, you had best join the Republican party;" but I will never go to the Democrats of Louisiana, or the Democrats from the beet-sugar raising States, and say to them, "There is one thing only upon the whole tariff list—sugar—that by reason of the differential in favor of refined sugar, reducing the tariff on raw sugar will give no benefit to the consumer, and yet, not for the purpose of reducing taxation to consumers here, not to relieve Cuba, but to satisfy the rapacity of the 'sugar trust' and the overprotected industries of this country desiring to get a preferential rate of duty in Cuba, without abating any of their exactions upon the American people; you must surrender and submit to such a proposition for fear it might appear we had voted against a reduction of the tariff."

We ought never to make such a demand upon our fellow-Democrats who represent the farmers of Louisiana and the beet sugar raisers of the West. Now, then, as to the distress. Every witness before the committee—if I misstate the proposition I invite correction—every witness stated that there is no distress in Cuba at present. Colonel Bliss, the collector of the port of Habana, who was sent here as the Government representative, testified that there was no suffering in Cuba, and that all labor was employed; that the wages for agricultural labor was from \$21 to \$30 per month.

Every witness testified that every man that wants to work in



Cuba can get work at wages not less than \$21 to \$30 per month. All the witnesses testified that the price for labor in Cuba exceeds the wages paid in the South for agricultural labor, and every gentleman here who comes from that section knows that is true. But they say that it is not the distress now, but it is the distress that will come for which we must provide relief. Why, they are paying from 12 to 18 per cent in Cuba for money, and yet they are holding on to their whole crop of sugar. Down in my country, when cotton got to 4½ cents a pound, and they can not raise it for less than 6 cents, the Federal Government did not come to our aid.

Out in Kansas, when they burned corn for fuel and they were mortgaged up to their eyes, the Federal Government never came to their relief. What did we do? Simply passed a national bankruptcy law, that people who had their property mortgaged for twice what it was worth might liquidate and start out even again. Yet they say we must pass this bill in order to relieve Cuba. It will not help Cuban laborers nor the little farmer that has already sold his crop, because he worked on the shares. It can only help, if anyone, those people who have piled up the sugar down there, able to hold it and pay 12 to 18 per cent to foreign banks and carry on farms that are mortgaged to twice their value—and the gentlemen who have gone down there in Cuba expecting to make more money than the present price of sugar will permit.

Now, it is a significant fact that in almost every instance the men who have bought sugar plantations in Cuba since the Spanish war are also connected directly or indirectly with the American sugar trust. It is also worthy of mention that since this bill has been agitated the price of "sugar trust" stock advances as the prospect brightens for its passage. Now, then, suppose distress does or will exist there because of the very low price of sugar everywhere; are we under any such obligations to the Cubans as requires us to make good to them the loss upon a crop which everybody concedes is over produced in the world to the extent of a million or more tons? The witnesses all tell us that the present low price of sugar is due to the fact that there is a million or more tons on the market more than the world can consume; that all Cuban sugar comes here, and the "sugar trust" is practically the only purchaser for it.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] yesterday, when my colleague from Texas [Mr. RANDELL] asked him:

As you state that the price of sugar will not be reduced to the consumer here, and the reduction in our revenue will be between \$5,000,000 and \$7,000,000 on sugar, if there is no competition in this country in reference to the purchaser of raw sugar, how does the Cuban hope to get an increase in price? Why can not the purchaser put it in his pocket?—

made this answer:

The sugar trust has got to have the sugar as much as the planter has got to sell it. If they do not buy it of them, they must go to Germany—and if they go to Germany they must pay more for it—or they must take this sugar. Each one is independent of the other.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the explanation of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] does not explain. The trust can go to Hamburg or to Cuba as it chooses. The Cuban planter can not go to Hamburg, because over there, after paying half his sugar is worth to get it there, he will find a surplus of more than a million tons in excess of the world's demand for sugar. That he can not go there is evidenced by the fact that he can not go there now, but must come here and sell to the trust the entire Cuban product and pay the present tariff rates. On the other hand, if we reduce the tariff on the Cuban sugar coming here 20 per cent, and the trust does not care to give the Cubans the benefit of it, it will simply say, "I do not care to buy your sugar."

The gentleman from New York says that "the trust has got to have it," when the proof shows that the product of sugar in Cuba is about 800,000 tons, while the world's surplus is more than a million tons. The trust can thus refuse to buy from the Cubans and fill from this surplus supply all its demands for American consumption until the Cuban gets ready to sell to the trust at the price the trust is willing to pay. If the Cuban is able to hold out against the trust, he is certainly not in such a distressed condition as to need relief from us. So, Mr. Chairman, while his answer might have been satisfactory to the gentleman from New York, I do not think my colleague was very much enlightened thereby. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, they say there is distress in Cuba and it is our duty to relieve it. I have attempted to show that distress does not exist there, and if it did, I deny that it is our duty to relieve it. It was well said by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MORRIS] that "we have expended \$250,000,000 in giving the Cubans their liberty." We relieved them of about \$300,000,000 indebtedness to Spain. We have also established splendid sanitary conditions in Habana. I know that to be the fact because I have visited that city since General Wood began his splendidly inaugurated system. It occurred to me while I was there that General Wood was putting sanitation, like any other good doctor, ahead

of everything else; he was investigating that and applying his ability thereto as his first consideration. He had the penitentiary there cleaner than this hall. He had all the old Spanish barracks cleaned out and had converted them into schools. He has done a splendid work, and I have no criticism to make of him.

But, say some, we are under obligations to give Cuba trade concessions because we forced the Platt amendment upon her, and she can not thereby make commercial treaties with any country other than this. That claim is not worthy attention. The only provision in regard to treaties in the "Platt amendment" is "that Cuba shall not enter into any treaty with any foreign power which will impair her independence." One need not be a lawyer to understand that this provision has no application to commercial treaties. No Democrat will contend that a commercial treaty, which is always made to further freer trade relations, is in any sense the impairment of the independence of either contracting party.

But, Mr. Chairman, if there was distress in Cuba, and we were under obligations to relieve it, in my judgment the pending bill would not relieve the distress or discharge the obligations. All the witnesses testified before the Committee on Ways and Means that the reduction provided in this bill from the tariff on Cuban sugar would not save the sugar planters. President Roosevelt is on record as saying so; Governor-General Wood says so; Colonel Bliss says so; president-elect of the Cuban Republic, Mr. Palma, says so. They are the friends of reciprocity with Cuba. We who oppose the bill deny that it will benefit the Cuban planters, but claim that the "sugar trust" will pocket the reduction. Colonel Bliss, the friend of reduction, only estimated that 30 per cent of the reduction would go to Cuban planters.

What will become of the other \$5,000,000 of our revenues which we are asked to vote away, even if the trust does not pocket the entire concession, as we claim? There is no gentleman on this side of the Chamber who will deny that it is in the power of the "sugar trust" to put all this concession into their pockets. They say if the trust does so that we will throw the responsibility on the trust; we will go before the American people and denounce the trust. I would like to know whom you would get to trust you if your legislation in Congress is such as to enable the trust to pocket \$6,000,000 to \$8,000,000 unless generously inclined to divide with the Cubans? It is not necessary to do this to convince the American people that the trust is a public enemy—something that everybody who is not in a trust now admits.

Besides, Mr. Chairman, this bill is unfair to Cuba at this time. If we want to be honest with the Cubans, if we think it right to give them some concessions and that concessions are necessary to relieve distress, we should simply reduce the tariff upon Cuban goods coming in here. Their tariff now upon our goods is less than one-third of the rates we charge them. We have a military government down there under General Wood. We had him fix these low rates of duty upon our goods going there. We have a Congress here. Why not simply lower our rates upon her goods coming here, without driving a conscienceless bargain, such as this? There is nobody authorized to represent the Cubans. I asked the gentleman from New York yesterday who was authorized to represent the Cubans or to agree for them. He said no one, so far as he knew. Now, in May the Cubans will have a government of their own choosing; that is, speaking theoretically—

Mr. CLARK. Ironically.

Mr. BALL of Texas. Yes; ironically, as the gentleman from Missouri says, because it so happens that the American authorities in Cuba, no doubt under instructions from the Republican Administration here, forced Cuba to elect a man for president of the new republic that had not set his foot upon her soil for twenty-five years. He is said to be with the trust himself. Still Cuba will have her own government in May. If we were not absolutely hypocritical in our professions, if relief for Cuba was our object, we would at this time lower our duties upon Cuban products temporarily, and wait until authorized representatives of Cuba could treat with us as to future trade relations. But that would not satisfy the "steel trust," the "beef trust," and all the other "trusts."

The "steel trust" and the "beef trust," the latter of which has within the last few days fixed the price of beef at such a figure as will cost the American consumers \$100,000,000 per annum, have said, "Before you shall relieve Cuba you must make them give us the trade that we may be able to get there, not at the 20 per cent reduction, but with a tariff of 20 per cent in our favor as against all the nations of the earth." The tariff in Cuba against them is only 5 per cent now. They want 20 per cent preferential there, and are willing to trade off the sugar interests here to get it, although the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] is reported to have said "he would die in the last ditch" before he would consent to a reduction of our duty on steel.

I yesterday questioned the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] as to whether it was not the fact that if the Cubans were



unable to grant or did not grant all the concessions that the bill asks—that if they refused to exempt a single article out of the thousands which we send them from the demanded reduction, or to pass our immigration laws, whether then this bill would not fall to the ground, and relief be refused Cuba. And the gentleman answered, "Yes."

I say, then, that it is unfair and hypocritical for gentlemen to come here and under the guise of humanity make a plea for "distressed Cuba," and at the same time say, "We have put a military government over you; we have elected a president for you who has not been in your country for a quarter of a century; you are on the verge of ruin, yet if you do not consent to this hard bargain, if you do not agree to it, you can starve and go into bankruptcy, or go to a warmer place than Cuba."

Mr. KLEBERG. And it is also proposed to require them to keep out the immigrants that we do not want there.

Mr. BALL of Texas. Yes. As suggested by my colleague [Mr. KLEBERG], we propose to force upon them our immigration laws without regard to whether it is to their interest to have such laws or not. We propose to put into the hands of the President of the United States legislative, judicial, and executive powers that he may present to the Cuban people a bill that is more onerous in its conditions than was the Platt amendment, against which every gentleman on this side of the Chamber voted.

I can not favor such cant and hypocrisy. If the Republican majority in this House desire to pass this bill, let them be honest with themselves and the country. Let them say bluntly and unblushingly that before they turn Cuba loose they will take advantage of her distressed condition to impose upon her a further renunciation of her rights of sovereignty, in order that the trusts of this country that have fattened upon the American people may grow richer and more powerful by devouring the substance of the Cubans, whose friends you pretend to be.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The gentleman from Texas speaks of our enforcing this obligation upon the Cuban people as if it were in line with the Platt proposition. Is it not true that it is proposed only to authorize an agreement to be made which the Cubans may, if they choose, assent to, in case they deem it beneficial to their interest to do so?

Mr. BALL of Texas. That is true; but I will ask the gentleman from Indiana whether he believes that the condition of distress which has here been spoken of exists to-day in Cuba?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I think it does not at this time.

Mr. BALL of Texas. All right. Now, if there is no distress down there at this time, if the Cubans are not yet in the possession of the right of self-government, if nobody authorized to speak for them has asked for the passage of this bill, the American Congress has no right, in order that these American trusts may rob those people, to demand at the hands of the Cubans at this time assent to this proposition. On the other hand, if it is true that there is distress in that country at the present time, it is hypocritical and cowardly for us to demand that in their distressed condition they shall make these concessions for the benefit of American industries which need no protection there.

Mr. Chairman, with Republican dissensions and differences I have no concern. I am glad to see gentlemen on the other side showing a lack of harmony upon this matter. I trust that in the providence of an all-wise Creator the result will be the wiping of a sufficient number of them out of the successful lists at the coming elections to give us a chance to look at the books and to put a check upon unrestrained Republican legislation.

It makes no difference to me that the Republican party, in looking over the field of American industry, when they framed their last national platform found only one industry to be made the subject of a specific promise—only one which it thought required special nurture—and that was the beet and cane sugar interests of this country, an industry that admittedly can not compete with the favorable climatic and other conditions in Cuba.

So the Republican convention solemnly promised those people that when they invested their money in this industry the Republican policy would not take any part of their protection away. It matters not to me that the gentleman from New York said that this protection would not be disturbed for twenty-five years. I think it is perfectly consistent for the Republican majority at its own pleasure—I do not criticise them for it—to break any promise on earth that they have made in case a different action will redound to their advantage.

The Republican party would be inconsistent to be consistent. [Laughter.] I care not what Republican protectionists may do in this matter. "Gentlemen upon this side of the Chamber who vote for a Republican Administration measure should not charge the opponents of the bill with protection proclivities. Certainly, my objections to the bill are not from a desire to "protect" anybody. I am against this bill as a Democrat, and shall point out some of the many reasons why, in my judgment, it contravenes Democratic theories, touching the use of the taxing power of the

Government. It is not my purpose to assail Democrats who insist upon voting for this bill.

I know that it does not commend itself to any Democrat here, and yet many Democrats will vote for it. No doubt the objections which are so potent with me are not so vital with them. Perhaps this is due to inability to agree either with my premises or conclusions. If they could see it as I do, they would conclude that there is not a line of Democratic thought in the bill from caption to finish. It is Republican in essence and substance and not in form only. It will bring no reduction in taxation to consumers here. It will result in a loss of revenue of from six to eight millions of dollars.

The "sugar trust" will be the chief if not the only beneficiary of the revenue we surrender. Under it we begin a system by which the taxing power of the Government, under the guise of reciprocity, is converted into an instrument of barter and trade with other countries, which followed up would prevent any such thing as tariff reform and engage us in a war of reprisals and retaliation with other countries. It gives double protection to the great trusts of the country. It forces Cuba to abandon a revenue-tariff system and adopt a protective-tariff system for the benefit of protected industries here.

#### CONSUMERS WILL NOT BE BENEFITED.

Now, as to the first proposition. All the witnesses before the Ways and Means Committee, for and against the bill, as well as the "sugar trust," which is urging it, concedes that this measure will not reduce the price to our consumers, and with this every Democratic member of the Ways and Means Committee and every Republican member of that committee is agreed. As a Democrat, I undertake to say that there can be no reduction of tariff in a Democratic sense that does not take off a part of the tax upon consumers. This proposition is therefore a mere juggling with tariff schedules and not a reduction of taxation.

I have endeavored in the course of my remarks to demonstrate that this condition is brought about by maintaining a differential or higher duty upon refined sugar than upon raw sugar coming here, this differential in favor of the "sugar trust" prohibiting the importation of refined sugar here and giving the trust control of our market.

I object to it, for the second reason, because it takes away, without reducing the price to the consumer, six to eight millions of dollars of revenue from the Federal Treasury and, in my judgment, puts it into the pockets of the sugar trust. I do not think that any Democrat desires to do that.

Now, this is why I say it will go to the sugar trusts: In the first place there is, as I understand it, 10,000,000 tons of sugar raised in the world. We constitute one-fifteenth of the population and we consume about one-quarter of the sugar raised in the world, or about two and a half million tons, I believe. We raise of that, from cane and from beets in this country, not counting Hawaii and Porto Rico, about 300,000 tons. Taking in the production of Hawaii and Porto Rico it makes about a third of our consumption. The balance is derived equally from Cuba and from foreign markets, as I understand it.

Now, there is a million tons of sugar on the market in the world more than there is demand for consumption. When this bill becomes a law it reduces the duty upon raw sugar 20 per cent and retains the differential in favor of the "sugar trust." That differential is also reduced 20 per cent, but it will still be one-tenth of a cent a pound, which means upon the Cuban sugar \$1,600,000 per annum at present rates. Now, no one can refine sugar in Cuba when he can ship the raw material over here at the same price and get \$1,600,000 more for it.

Consequently there can be no reduction to the consumer except by grace of the trust, and if gentlemen on this side of the Chamber are willing to give away \$8,000,000 on a bare chance that it will reach distressed Cubans in case distress should occur, which does not now exist, and trust the American Sugar Refining Company to distribute it, they certainly have faith to beat the band and faith sufficient to warrant them in being very hopeful for the hereafter. [Laughter.] So far as I am concerned, I decline to take \$8,000,000 of revenue out of the Federal Treasury and start it on its way to anticipate distress in Cuba and trust the American sugar trust to distribute it. [Applause.]

Now, as to the policy of reciprocity. Once this so-called reciprocity is entered upon, what becomes of your tariff schedules adjusted from the American standpoint for revenue only? Why, they tell me that Thomas Jefferson believed in reciprocity. There have been more crimes committed in the name of Thomas Jefferson than there have been in the name of liberty. Men who never vote a Democratic ticket quote Thomas Jefferson. Men who do not subscribe to anything that Jefferson ever taught or believed quote Thomas Jefferson in order to sustain their arguments.

I undertake to say that Mr. Jefferson through his whole life believed in and looked forward to and hoped for a happy and prosperous agricultural and pastoral people. Mr. Jefferson taught



that commerce should be the handmaiden of agriculture. He never taught that agriculture should be the slave and handmaiden of commerce. If any gentleman will show me where Thomas Jefferson ever proposed by reciprocal duties to swap off the American agricultural interests at any time in order to give great corporations and trusts that are robbing our people here and want to rob the Cubans abroad entry into foreign markets, then I will agree to resign my seat in Congress, and I have no present desire to do that. [Laughter.]

The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. McCLELLAN] quoted Mr. Jefferson to show that he favored reciprocity. The gentleman from New York calls upon Mr. Jefferson when it suits his purpose. If he were called upon to follow Jefferson in advocating the free coinage of gold and silver, even at the commercial ratio, he would say that conditions had changed since Mr. Jefferson's time. Since Mr. Jefferson's time we have utterly changed our tariff system. We had no Dingley tariff then. We sought only to get a market for agricultural products under a policy of free trade, or the freest possible trade. If Mr. Jefferson had views as to reciprocity then, conditions were utterly different from those now existing. They differed certainly as night from day from the reciprocity ideas in this bill.

In Mr. Jefferson's day our tariff duties were not restrictive of free commerce with all nations, while foreign restrictions upon our trade and upon our vessels were numerous and vexatious. His only idea was by friendly arrangements with the nations, where such restriction existed, to secure, by friendly arrangements, their repeal, and as a last resort, in case of failure, by countervailing duties here, which he greatly deprecated, to compel other governments to treat us with the same liberality we treated them. Mr. Jefferson said:

Free commerce and navigation are not to be given in exchange for restrictions and vexations.

In the report from which the gentleman from New York quoted on yesterday, sent to the House of Representatives on December 16, 1793, Mr. Jefferson, then Secretary of State, advocated free trade with all nations or with any nation that would accede thereto. Let me read therefrom:

Would even a single nation begin with the United States this system of free commerce, it would be advisable to begin it with that nation, since it is one by one only that it can be extended to all.

Further on, from the same document quoted by the gentleman from New York, I read:

Our commerce is certainly of a character to entitle it to favor in most countries. The commodities we offer are either necessities of life or materials for manufacture or convenient subjects of revenue, and we take in exchange either manufactures, when they have received the last finish of art and industry, or mere luxuries.

How different the application of Mr. Jefferson's views from the views of the gentleman from New York [Mr. McCLELLAN] embodied in this bill. Our tariff laws here were not then restrictive. Mr. Jefferson sought a market for agricultural products going abroad by giving free trade to finished products coming here.

Thus he sought to confer a benefit upon the producers and consumers of this country alike. This bill proposes leaving the high-protective tariff, by which consumers and taxpayers are subjected to monopoly and trust robbery at home, untouched and give these monopolies and trusts additional advantages by bringing the products of Cuba, agricultural and horticultural, in competition here with our agricultural interests in such a way as to inflict a loss upon our producers without reduction of taxation to consumers and to further enrich the "sugar trust." Think of Thomas Jefferson standing for such a policy!

Why, Mr. Jefferson was trying to open a market for the farmers of this country, not for the trusts. No man ought to call upon the name of Thomas Jefferson and intimate that he would have gone down to a helpless country, tied hand and foot, with our military governor still there, and say to them, "You are starving; you are distressed; you have nothing but sugar; we will give you 20 per cent reduction that will not help our consumers, but go to the trusts, but unless you give 20 per cent preferential duty on everything manufactured in this country, which the trusts are selling abroad for less than they are selling at home, you may starve and your distress go unrelieved." Think of Thomas Jefferson proposing a thing like that!

Now, reciprocity treaties, when entered upon, mean the surrender of the constitutional prerogative of this House to originate revenue bills. They mean treaties negotiated by the Senate fixing all tariff schedules. Over in the Senate, at the other end of the Capitol, they have already brought in a report saying that they have authority—and I believe they have—to negotiate tariff treaties without reference to the wishes or convictions of the House of Representatives. Once done, just as in the oleomargarine and the butter fight, upon which my friends from Minnesota and myself are so wide apart, it is a question of the most powerful industry getting the most votes to cripple another.

When we once enter upon this programme and mode of adjusting tariff schedules, the result will be that you will start a competition in this country of the great and powerful interests seeking to gain entree into foreign markets by making a sacrifice of the weaker vessels. What does that mean? Who are always the most powerful? Will organized capital, in the shape of consolidation along modern lines, led by those the President of the United States calls "captains of industry," be the ones that will go to the wall; or will it be the agricultural and horticultural interests of this country that will be sacrificed for trade concession for overprotected monopolies?

What do you think about it? Other countries will have their own peculiar interests to consult. There will be certain classes of goods that they wish to get in here without regard to our interests, and there will be a conflict of interests at home and abroad. Instead of adhering to the true doctrine of Mr. Jefferson, "Peace, amity, and commerce with all nations, entangling alliances with none," making tariffs here that all could afford to come and do business under upon equal terms, treating them fairly and honestly and giving them the same privileges, we will have retaliatory measures, reprisals, conflicts of greedy and selfish interests, that will make it impossible to form a scientific, properly adjusted schedule for revenue for "the support of the Government honestly and economically administered."

How much time have I remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has four minutes remaining.

Mr. BALL of Texas. Now, another thing, Mr. Chairman. While I do not believe in the formation of tariff schedules by reciprocity treaties, I am not alone in my opinions. The doctrine of reciprocity was inaugurated once before in this country and failed, and we are not without Democratic declaration upon that point. After Mr. Blaine had negotiated his celebrated reciprocity treaties the Democratic party met in convention, in 1892, and made the best tariff plank, in my judgment, ever written in the history of the Democratic party. It was short, simple, and easily understood. It declared what I believe then and now indorse, "that the Government is without constitutional power to lay and collect taxes except for the support of the Government, honestly and economically administered." That was and is good Democracy; but they did not stop there. The Blaine treaties had then been negotiated, and here is what they said about that kind of treaties:

Trade interchange on the basis of reciprocal advantages to the countries participating is a time-honored doctrine of the Democratic faith, but we denounce the sham reciprocity which juggles with the people's desire for enlarged foreign markets and freer exchange by pretending to establish closer trade relations for a country whose articles of export are almost exclusively agricultural products with other countries that are also agricultural, while erecting a custom-house barrier of prohibitive tariff taxes against the richest, and the countries of the world that stand ready to take our entire surplus of products, and to exchange therefor commodities which are necessities and comforts of life among our own people.

What does this bill propose? Precisely the same character of treaty that Mr. Blaine negotiated in the behalf of those same interests. That is, the concessions we give are purely to agricultural products, a menace to the agricultural interests here, while the concessions they give us are to the overprotected interests of this country, who, not content with robbing us, desire to go down to Cuba and rob them to the tune of 20 per cent more than they are now robbing them. So that, as was so tersely and well stated by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, General DICK, whose astuteness as a campaign manager is well known, "If you adopt this policy it means free trade for the farmers and protection for the trusts."

I am sure that no Democrat desires to enter upon such a policy. There is another objection. The bill gives double protection. Can that be Democratic? I can prove this proposition absolutely beyond question. It is not contended that the present prohibitive rates of the Dingley bill, which prevent competition with American industrial interests here, will be affected so far as our producers and consumers are concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CLARK. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be allowed to conclude his remarks.

Mr. PAYNE. I would like to know something about that, for it is about time to adjourn.

Mr. BALL of Texas. I do not care to go on to-morrow, and I will conclude my remarks in about fifteen minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. I will not object to fifteen minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may continue for fifteen minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BALL of Texas. The American consumer will not be benefited by this bill. How about the trusts? I have already shown that the "sugar trust" is protected here by a differential in their favor which gives them the control of our market by naming the price of raw sugar to the producer and refined sugar



to the consumer, and that under this bill the differential is still retained enabling the "sugar trust" to buy its raw sugar cheaper without the necessity of reducing the price of refined sugar to the consumer. It can not be denied also that the present high tariff rates effectually prevent foreign competition from forcing a reduction of the price of articles manufactured by the trusts, which control the industrial interests of this country. They are therefore left unrestrained to garner enormous profits at the expense of our people. That is protection number one.

Now for the double protection. By this bill we do not demand of Cuba that she shall reduce her tariffs upon our goods seeking a market there. We simply exact at her hands that she must charge all other countries with which she deals 20 per cent higher duties than she charges us. Therefore American manufacturers who are now getting into Cuba upon equal terms with all the world will, when this bill becomes a law, be able to tax Cuba 20 per cent more than her consumers are now paying. In other words, we protect them here against foreign competition and force Cuba to protect them there against all competition.

Now, does not this give the "trusts" double protection?

But, Mr. Chairman and fellow-members, there is one proposition, which is the last I shall make, which ought to condemn this measure in Democratic hearts and Democratic minds—a proposition that makes the bill absolutely indefensible from a *Democratic standpoint*. This measure forces Cuba to abandon her system of tariff for revenue only and *adopt a protective-tariff system*. What Democrat will defend such a proposition? Nay, more; it forces Cuba to adopt a protective system against her own interests and not for her protection, but for the protection of our industries seeking a market there. We do not say to Cuba, "Reduce your duties upon our goods and let your consumers get the benefit thereof," but "Make your duties as you will, provided they be 20 per cent greater upon the goods of other countries than upon our goods."

Let me demonstrate that Cuba is now upon a revenue basis. In the first place, her tariffs have been fixed by our own agents, and adjusted for no other purpose than to supply revenues to run our military government there. All concessions that could be made in our favor have already been made. According to Colonel Bliss, our collector at Habana, Cuba's tariff rates now average an *ad valorem* duty of 21½ per cent. We furnish Cuba all her flour, 75 per cent of her mules, 95 per cent of her hogs, 99 per cent of her corn, 89 per cent of her bran and fodder, 98 per cent of her oats, 90 per cent of her hay, all her canned, fresh, salt, and pickled beef, nearly all her bacon, ham, pork, lard, oleo-margarine, condensed milk, wood, lumber, shingles, and furniture.

In addition to these products we also send to Cuba, of her total imports, brick, 90 per cent; railway and street cars, 99½ per cent; coal, 99 per cent; steel and steel rails, 88 per cent; agricultural machinery, 98 per cent; sewing machines, 90 per cent; engines, locomotives, and boilers, 82 per cent; sugar machinery, 93 per cent; all other machinery, 88 per cent. We are therefore not suffering to get the products of our mines, farms, forests, and pastures into Cuba. It is true she takes by far the larger part of her cotton goods from foreign lands, but that is not due to our inability to get into her market. Cuban rates upon cotton goods is but 23½ per cent. We get into China in competition with the world without a discriminating duty in our favor and without the advantage of near-by transportation. The reason we do not get into Cuba our cotton goods is that our patterns and styles are not adapted to their tastes and our merchants do not give long-time accommodations. Other countries have studied their wants; we must do the same.

But I have digressed somewhat from the proposition that Cuba is now upon a revenue basis so far as her tariff rates are concerned. I will say in passing that our agricultural products, sugar machinery, and structural iron are now practically upon the free list, the rate upon the latter being only 5 per cent *ad valorem* duty. It developed before the Ways and Means Committee that the revenues derived from the present tariff were hardly sufficient to support the government, and that the Cubans were disinclined to resort to other forms of taxation. Under the Platt amendment Cuba can not contract debts in excess of her revenues. Therefore, to give us the preferential duty of 20 per cent demanded by this bill, she must do it not by lowering her duty upon our goods, but by raising her duties upon foreign goods, thereby necessarily increasing their cost to Cuban consumers.

In proof of my statement that it would be necessary, in complying with this bill, to have Cuba change her revenue system to a protective system, I quote from the testimony of Colonel Bliss before the Ways and Means Committee:

In order to secure this trade it would be necessary to inaugurate a new system of tariff for Cuba, under which the minimum duty would be equal to the duty charged now, while the maximum would be, perhaps, about 33½ per

cent higher. In some cases it need not be that high, while in others it would have to be higher.

Commenting upon this statement, the chairman of the committee [Mr. PAYNE] said:

Sufficiently advanced, in other words, to give the trade to the United States?

To which Colonel Bliss replied:

Yes, sir.

Some gentlemen insist that Cuba might reduce her tariffs upon our goods and not raise them upon other foreign goods and still have revenues sufficient for her purposes. This upon the theory that a reduction of duty might increase importations and cause a corresponding increase of revenue. While this might be true, and would be true if Cuba had a protective system now, it is not true that you can increase revenues by lowering duties upon importations already admitted upon a revenue basis.

But, Mr. Chairman, even if we concede that the Cubans would reduce their tariff upon our goods going there under this bill and not raise her duties upon importations from other countries, my proposition is still true; because if Cuba can afford to lower her duties upon our products and increase her revenues, it is also true that she could lower her duties upon other foreign importations and increase her revenue thereby and give her consumers the benefit of competition. Gentlemen who contend otherwise are begging the question and standing out against a common-sense proposition. The whole purpose of the bill is to say to Cuba, "You must give American industries protection to the extent of 20 per cent against foreign competition."

Now, where is the Democrat who can consistently say that protection is all wrong for American industries at our expense and all right in Cuba at her expense for the benefit of interests not her own? It is high handed and indefensible for us to go to helpless Cubans, under the pretense of giving them relief and giving them liberty, and say to them, you must make a perpetual treaty that you will at all times give the industrial interests of this country the advantage of 20 per cent, and 20 per cent protection, regardless of what your interests may be and regardless of what the cost to the consumers in Cuba may be.

If there is a Democrat that will get up here and announce that that proposition is not absolutely indefensible, that it is not grossly immoral, outrageously unjust, undemocratic in substance, in form, and in everything that goes to make up Democratic faith and Democratic doctrine, I want to hear him. It makes no difference what gentlemen's views may be as to whether this relief will go to Cuba or whether relief ought to go to Cuba, they ought not to violate Democratic doctrine in order to advance selfish special interests.

Members are here condemning Louisiana sugar men and beet-sugar men for voting in their interest, as they say, regardless of Democracy, and yet they propose to vote for a bill that forces Cubans to protect American industries for all time to come to the extent of 20 per cent against all foreign competition. How dare they criticise Louisiana Democrats and beet-sugar men for saying it is wrong to make an exception against them in a manner that does not inure to the benefit of the American consumer under the pretense of tariff reduction or getting reciprocal trade relations?

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to attempt to influence any Democrat on this floor. I care not how the Republicans vote, but when Democrats tell me that in order to prevent criticism at home, for fear somebody will say that I voted against tariff reduction, and to avoid the necessity of an explanation, I should vote for this un-Republican and un-Democratic measure, this hybrid which comes here under the tongue of disrepute, repudiated by the Cubans themselves (because their absentee President says that less than 33½ per cent will do Cuba no good, and General Wood tells you that 20 per cent reduction will do Cuba no good), I answer that I will not accept such advice.

So far as I am concerned, when I get home they will not ask me for an explanation. The only explanation that was ever asked of a Democrat down in the Democratic stronghold of Texas is, How comes so many Democrats to vote with the Republicans? [Laughter.] We always have to explain that when we do. [Laughter.] No Democrat was ever asked, when the Populist party was about to take Texas away from the Democracy, why Democrats voted against Republican measures. The question was always, Why do so many Democrats vote with Republicans in Congress and help them get through their measures? [Laughter.]

This is an Administration measure; this is a trust measure; this is an un-Democratic measure. I do not care about its violation of Republican-platform pledges—it does not come here under the banner of Democracy. There is no Democratic standpoint from which you can defend it, and if I have to make an explanation when I go home, I am going to cast a vote here that I can explain when I reach there.

I will not cast a vote that the only explanation I could give would be that I was afraid that somebody might think I voted against tariff reduction, when, if any man asked me if it was for tariff reduction, I would be obliged to tell him no.

I expect to vote, as I have in the past, according to my convictions, with sincerity and perfect fidelity to my sense of duty and allegiance to Democracy, conceding to every gentleman here on this side of the Chamber, if he sees fit to differ with me, the right to do so. I intend always to cast my vote regardless of what somebody at home may be thinking, and without keeping my ear to the ground to hear the rumbling of popular opinion.

I intend to so vote that I can go home and say to my people: This bill was not approved by anybody; that it came in here as a compromise Republican Administration measure as the handiwork of Republicans whipped into line by patronage and promises of various kinds and under pressure from improper influences. I do not want to be obliged to admit that we got into the Republican band wagon for fear somebody would think we were all gone wrong on tariff reform.

I will tell them I believed the measure was brought in to help out the Republican Administration, to help out the Republican leaders from an unpleasant dilemma; that it was Democratic in no degree or in any respect; that it gave double protection to the trusts; that it put \$8,000,000 into the pockets of the sugar trust and took it out of the Federal Treasury without any benefit to the American consumer; that it is sham reciprocity; that we were holding up the Cubans while they were helpless and forcing them to accept conditions more onerous than the Platt amendment.

I will tell them these were my honest, conscientious convictions, and they will say to me what they have always said heretofore—that "We want you to vote your convictions, even if you make a mistake sometimes, because we don't want a Representative that is afraid to vote against Republican principles for fear he will incur criticism at home." [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. DALZELL having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. SHERMAN reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 12765) to provide for reciprocal trade relations with Cuba, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. R. 74. Joint resolution relating to publications of the Geological Survey—to the Committee of Printing.

S. 234. An act granting an increase of pension to James Frey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 694. An act granting a pension to Jane Caton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions;

S. 899. An act granting an increase of pension to George F. Bowers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions;

S. 1934. An act to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Biloxi, in the State of Mississippi—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds;

S. 2409. An act granting an increase of pension to John A. Rotan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2738. An act granting an increase of pension to James W. Hankins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2975. An act granting an increase of pension to Levi Hatchett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3334. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. James—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3421. An act for the relief of Eleonora G. Goldsborough—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3992. An act granting an increase of pension to David M. McKnight—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4042. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Norton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

And then, on motion of Mr. PAYNE (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Herman Graef against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Surgeon-General of the Army and recommending the retirement of that officer with the rank of major-general—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to the inquiry of the House, a report in relation to improvements in the Missouri River near St. Joseph—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, recommending certain amendments in the fortifications appropriation bill—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. MOODY of Oregon, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2632) to amend an act entitled "An act granting to the Clearwater Valley Railway Company a right of way through the Nez Perces Indian land in Idaho," reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1515); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH, from the Committee on Pacific Railroads, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10299) authorizing the Santa Fe Pacific Railway Company to sell or lease its railroad property and franchises, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1518); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GRIFFITH, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3800) to grant certain lands to the State of Idaho, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1519); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BURTON, from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, to which was referred the joint resolution of the Senate (S. R. 56) providing for a modification in the adopted project for the improvement of Everett Harbor, Washington, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1520); which said joint resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 945) granting an increase of pension to William W. Richardson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1516); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12468) for the relief of Phineas Curran, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1517); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SALMON, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4969) for the relief of Madison County, Ky., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1521); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills; which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3243) granting a pension to William Cromie—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 13148) for the relief of the personal representatives of John McCabe and Patrick McCabe, deceased—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 13474) providing for the construction of 30 submarine torpedo boats—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.



By Mr. YOUNG: A bill (H. R. 13475) to provide for the improvement in breeding of horses for general-purpose uses, and to enable the United States to procure better remounts for the cavalry and artillery service—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: A bill (H. R. 13500) for the establishment of a light-house and fog signal at Isle au Haut, Me.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLMSTED, from the Committee on Elections No. 2: A resolution (H. Res. 205) on the contested-election case of John E. Fowler v. Charles R. Thomas—to the House Calendar.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 13476) granting a pension to James Hawkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 13477) granting an increase of pension to Jason Stevens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOUGLAS: A bill (H. R. 13478) granting an increase of pension to Charles La Forest—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLET of New York: A bill (H. R. 13479) granting a pension to Ira P. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HANBURY: A bill (H. R. 13480) to provide an American register for the steamer *Brooklyn*—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JACKSON of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 13481) to correct the military record of William Martinson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEHOE: A bill (H. R. 13482) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin B. Morris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13483) for the relief of Robert Ross—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LESSLER: A bill (H. R. 13484) granting a pension to Hermann Cantor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 13485) granting a pension to Louisa Josephine Stanwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13486) granting an increase of pension to Elvira P. Gill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. METCALF: A bill (H. R. 13487) granting a pension to Cornelia A. Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURK of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 13488) granting a pension to George A. Cooper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS of Maine: A bill (H. R. 13489) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Ephraim W. Reynolds—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13490) granting a pension to Wilson M. Mayo—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13491) granting a pension to Franklin Palmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 13492) granting an increase of pension to John W. Simpson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13493) for the relief of Lewis Anderson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STORM: A bill (H. R. 13494) to provide for the extension of letters patent for an "Improvement in insulating submarine cables"—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 13495) for the relief of R. N. White—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13496) for the relief of the heirs of C. H. Foy—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. YOUNG: A bill (H. R. 13497) for the relief of the heirs of Dr. Samuel E. Hall, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13498) for the relief of John T. Brewster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 13499) granting a pension to Adam Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS: Resolution of Typographical Union No. 2, of Philadelphia, Pa., in opposition to House bill 5777, amending the copyright law—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. BROWN: Resolutions of the Wisconsin Farmers' Institute, Oconomowoc, Wis., relative to the coloring of oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of the same institution, in favor of the rural free-delivery system—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of the same, favoring a bill for the establish-

ment and maintenance of schools of mines and mining—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. BURK of Pennsylvania: Resolution of Typographical Union No. 2, of Philadelphia, Pa., in opposition to House bill 5777, amending the copyright law—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of Naval Command No. 1, Camp 91, Spanish-American War Veterans, Philadelphia, Pa., in support of House bill 3097, to reimburse them for money spent in clothing, etc.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petitions of mariners and citizens of Gloucester, Me., and vicinity, for a light-house at the southwest entrance of Isle au Haut Thoroughfare, State of Maine—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CANNON: Papers to accompany House bill 13472, granting an increase of pension to Lewis E. Wilcox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CASSEL: Resolutions of Lieutenant William N. Child Post, No. 226, Marietta, Pa., and John M. Good Post, No. 502, Elizabethtown, Pa., Grand Army of the Republic, approving of House bill 3067—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOMBS: Petition of R. Wylie and others, of Napa, Cal., asking for an amendment to the Constitution defining legal marriage—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of Retail Clerks' Union No. 506, of Petaluma, Cal., favoring the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the same, favoring the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CONRY: Petition of Charles McManus and others, urging the passage of House bills 178 and 179, proposing to reduce the tax on whisky—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COONEY: Protest of business men of Humansville, Mo., against the enactment of House bill 6578, known as the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CROMER: Petition of A. McCormick and others, urging the passage of House bills 178 and 179, proposing to reduce the tax on whisky—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of Typographical Union No. 284, of Anderson, Ind., relating to House bill 5777—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, resolution of Bolt and Nut Makers' Union, of Muncie, Ind., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FEELY: Petitions of sundry Polish societies of Chicago, Ill., favoring House bill 16, for the erection of an equestrian statue to the late General Pulaski at Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petitions of the Chicago Daily Drivers' Journal and the Live Stock World, requesting the enactment of the Wadsworth substitute in lieu of House bill 9206—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HANBURY: Papers to accompany House bill 13216, for the relief of Simon W. Larkin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 7775, granting an increase of pension to David Parker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of the New York Produce Exchange, favoring House bill 8337, to amend an act to regulate commerce—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of Levi P. Morton Club, Ocean Hill Republican Club, of Brooklyn, and Coopers' International Union No. 2, of New York City, in favor of the proposed increase of pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, letters of New York and Cuba Mail Steamship Company, of New York, Holland-American Line, of New York, Hamburg-American Line, of New York, and John C. Seager Company, of New York, protesting against the passage of House bill No. 9059, known as the Tawney bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HEPBURN: Resolutions of Federal Labor Union of Centerville, Iowa, favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. JACK: Petition of J. M. Guffey Division, No. 579, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Greensburg, Pa., favoring the passage of the Hoar-Grosvenor anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Transfiguration Society, of Mount Pleasant, Pa., favoring the erection of a statue to the late Brigadier-General Count Pulaski at Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of G. W. M. Henry and others of Latrobe, Pa., urging the passage of House bills 178 and 179, proposing to reduce the tax on whisky—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of Finley Patch Post, No. 137, Blairsville, Pa.,

and E. R. Brady Post, No. 242, Brookville, Pa., Grand Army of the Republic, favoring a bill providing pensions to certain officers and men in the Army and Navy of the United States when 50 years of age and over, and increasing widows' pensions to \$12 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KERN: Resolutions of the Labor Union No. 8060, of New Athens, and Labor Union No. 8997, of Salem, Ill., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of Lodge No. 545, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of East St. Louis, Ill., in support of the bill known as "the Foraker-Corliss safety-appliance bill"—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of Ellsworth Post, No. 669, Grand Army of the Republic, Columbia, Ill., favoring the construction of war vessels in the United States navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LANHAM: Resolutions of Lodge No. 491, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, Austin, Tex., favoring an educational restriction on immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of the same lodge, in favor of the exclusion of the Chinese—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Petition of citizens of Thomaston, Me., for an appropriation for a monument to the memory of Maj. Gen. Henry Knox—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, resolutions of Pine Tree Lodge, No. 366, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LLOYD: Protest of 54 merchants of Clarence, Mo., against the enactment of a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Canton, Mo., asking for the passage of House bills 178 and 179—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAHON: Resolutions of Surgeon Charles Bower Post, No. 457, Newton, Pa., and A. G. Tucker Post, No. 52, Lewisburg, Pa., Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the passage of House bill 3067—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MUTCHLER: Paper to accompany House bill 13451, to correct the military record of Charles Mohn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 12382, granting a pension to William Sands—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions of Robert Oldham Post, No. 527, and L. F. Chapman Post, No. 61, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Pennsylvania, favoring the passage of House bill 3067—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions of Street Railway Employees, Division No. 169, of Easton, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of Typographical Union No. 2, of Philadelphia, Pa., in opposition to House bill 5777, amending the copyright law—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, resolution of Onoka Lodge, No. 211, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, Easton, Pa., asking that the desert-land laws be repealed, etc.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, resolutions of Onoka Lodge, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, and Electrical Workers' Union No. 91, of Easton, Pa., favoring the exclusion of Chinese laborers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OTJEN: Petition of J. E. Rivers and other citizens of Wisconsin in favor of House bills 178 and 179, reducing the tax on distilled spirits—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS: Resolution of Milkmen's Protective Union No. 8744, Rochester, N. Y., favoring the construction of war vessels at the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. POWERS of Maine: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Franklin Palmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Carter B. Harrison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of B. C. Knapp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petition of Federal Labor Union No. 6620, of Fort Wayne, Ind., favoring the restriction of the immigration of cheap labor from the south and east of Europe—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RYAN: Petition of Buffalo Branch of International Musical Union, asking for amendment of section 5 of the immigration law to protect American musicians—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: Papers to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to John W. Simpson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STARK: Papers to accompany House bill 13320, granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Simmons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of the heirs of C. H. Foy—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of R. N. White—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Paper to accompany House bill 13499, granting a pension to Adam Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON: Resolutions of Levi P. Morton Club, of Brooklyn, N. Y., indorsing House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of the Sam Smith Protective Union, No. 9099, of Brooklyn, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of Miriam Hibbs and other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., for an amendment to the Constitution preventing polygamous marriages—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of John Kilinski Society, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill 16—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of Typographical Union of Philadelphia, Pa., urging the defeat of House bill 5777 and Senate bill 2894, amending the copyright law—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of the Woman Suffrage Society of the county of Philadelphia, Pa., asking for the appointment of a commission to investigate woman suffrage in Western States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZENOR: Resolutions of Clark Lodge, No. 297, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, Jeffersonville, Ind., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

## SENATE.

THURSDAY, April 10, 1902.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. GALLINGER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal will stand approved, without objection. It is approved.

SURG. GEN. GEORGE M. STERNBERG.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Surgeon-General of the Army, giving his reasons why Congress should retire him with the rank of major-general in the Army of the United States on the 8th of June next; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

THE TRANSPORT SERVICE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of January 21, 1902, a letter from the Commissary-General, inclosing a revised exhibit showing the cost to the Subsistence Department of the United States transports plying between the United States and the Philippine Islands during the year ended December 31, 1901, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table, and be printed.

SPANISH TREATY CLAIMS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney-General, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 24th ultimo, a list of the claims which he is now defending before the Spanish Treaty Claims Commission, together with the number, the names and residences of all the claimants, the citizenship, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented a memorial of Typographical Union No. 284, of Anderson, Ind., remonstrating against the adoption of certain amendments to the copyright law; which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented petitions of the Puritan Bed Spring Company, of Bass and Woodworth, and of the Western Furniture Company, all of the city of Indianapolis, in the State of Indiana, praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the interstate-commerce law; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.